A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

NECESSITY

OF

REFORMATION,

With Respect to the

Errors and Corruptions

OF THE

Church of Rome.

The First Part.

Imprimatur.

Feb. 8. 1686. *H. Maurice R^mo P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.*

The Second Edition.

LONDON,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

NECESSITY

OF

REFORMATION,

With Reſpect to the

Errors and Corruptions

OF THE

Church of Rome.

AMONG the many Errors of the Church of *Rome*, there is one eſpecially that puts a bar, not only to the Reformation of her ſelf, but of all other Churches which depend upon her; and that is the Doctrine of her Infallibility; If ſhe cannot err, neither ſhe, nor any other Church that follows her conduct, can ſtand in need of being reform'd; for where there can be no Error, there can be nothing amiſs; and where there can be nothing amiſs, there can be no need of Reformation.

'Tis therefore needful to remove this Prejudice, in order to the clearing of the way to the enſuing Diſcourſe.

1096127

When the Romaniſts aſſert, that their Church is Infallible, and theirs only; we may in reaſon expect, that they ſhould produce good Proof, that their Church is ſo highly privileged above all other Churches: This they ſay they do, and their Proofs they tell us are ſo convincing, that they may paſs for no leſs than Demonſtrations: But, alas, when we come to examine them, we find our ſelves ſtrangely diſappointed; inſtead of Demonſtrations, we meet with nothing that amounts to ſo much as Probability.

Their pretended Proofs are taken from Scripture, from Reaſon, and from the Authority of the ancient Church.

I. Thoſe from Scripture are many, but all of them as impertinent, as that of their Angelical Doctor, to prove that all Men are not equally bound to have an explicite Faith, becauſe 'tis ſaid, Job 1. 14. *that the Oxen were plowing, and the Aſſes were feeding beſides them.* For,

Firſt, They do not prove that any Church now in being is Infallible.

Secondly, Much leſs that the Church of *Rome* is.

Firſt, They do not prove, that any Church now in being is Infallible. I ſay now in being, becauſe we grant, that there was a time, when even particular Churches were in their Guides Infallible, *viz.* while the Apoſtles liv'd, and took upon them the Government of particular Churches: And many of thoſe Scriptures which the Romaniſts produce for the Infallibility of their preſent Church, peculiarly relate to that time, and to thoſe Perſons: For inſtance, theſe Promiſes, *The Comforter which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have ſaid unto you. I have many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; Howbeit when the Spirit of Truth is come, he ſhall guide you into all Truth for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf, but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak, and he ſhall ſhew you things to come.*

John 14. 26.

Joh. 16. 12, 13.

'Tis plain, that theſe Promiſes are to be limited to the Apoſtles, and thoſe Diſciples only, who perſonally convers'd with our Saviour; becauſe they were made to thoſe to whom he himſelf had ſpoken, and to whoſe remembrance the Holy Ghoſt was to bring thoſe things he had before told them; to thoſe to whom he had many more things to ſay, which they were not yet able to bear; to thoſe who had been with Chriſt from the beginning; to thoſe from whom Chriſt was now going away,

and

and whom he had before told of his departure; to those to whom the Holy Ghost was to shew things to come; a Privilege which the present *Roman* Church does not, I think, so much as pretend to.

And for those other Scriptures, which extend to succeeding Ages; tho' they do for the most part concern the Catholick only, and not any particular Church; yet they neither assert nor promise any such thing as absolute Infallibility.

Let it be supposed, that S. *Paul* calls the Church, *the Pillar and Ground of Truth* (for these words may as well be connected with, and apply'd to that Summary of Christian Doctrine, which follows) must the meaning needs be, that the Church cannot err? May it not justly lay claim to this Title. 1. If it do not actually err, tho' it is fallible, and may err? If nothing may be call'd a Pillar that is capable of any defect, S. *Peter*'s Church in *Rome*, will have no Pillar left to support it. Or, 2. If it doth not err in things necessary to Salvation. That may be truly call'd a Pillar, that upholds all that is needful to the being of the House, tho' it do not support every little part, but suffers here and there a Tile or a Stone to fall to the ground. Or, 3. If together with all necessary Truths it gives support to some Errors: As we frequently see those Pillars that uphold the Building; together with it, they also support other things, that are laid upon it, and are no better than a nuisance and incumbrance to it. And such a Pillar of Truth, the Romanists must be forc'd to grant the Universal Church hath sometimes been; for has it not for some Ages maintain'd those Doctrines, which the present Church of *Rome* condemns as erroneous? Tho' the truth is, the Church here spoken of, was that in which *Timothy* was directed how to behave himself; and that was the Church of *Ephesus*, (or in the largest sense, that of *Asia*, of which *Ephesus* was the *Metropolis*) and that this Church hath fundamentally err'd, must needs be granted, there being not one Family of Christians now to be found in *Ephesus*. 1 Tim. 3 15. Mr. *Rycaut*'s present State of the *Greek* Church, *p* 54.

From that Promise of our Saviour, that *the gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church*, they can by no means infer Infallibility, till they have first prov'd that the Gates of Hell prevail against every Society; yea, against every Person, that is not infallible: And when that shall be once prov'd, the Gates of Hell will be so largely extended, and those who enter in at them so numerous, that 'tis to be fear'd, S. *Peter* will never more be put to the trouble of opening the Gates of Heaven for any Man. Matth. 16. 18.

'Tis

Matth. 28. 20. 'Tis true, Christ hath promised to *be with his Church always, even to the end of the World.* But if all those with whom Christ is present, are infallible, then every sincere Christian in the World is, so; and then what will become of the Pope's Prerogative? When the poorest Mechanick, in case he be but an honest Christian, will be as infallible a Guide of Controversies, as he is now by his Flatterers pretended to be.

And as little to this purpose, is that other Promise of our Saviour; *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am* Matth. 18. 20. *I in the midst of them.* For if Christ's being in the midst of them, does make them infallible; since 'tis sure he will never be worse than his word: 'tis also certain, that if but two or three only shall meet together in his name in *London*, they will be, when so met together, infallible. And if Infallibility may be had at home, and at so cheap a rate, great Fools are they, that will put themselves to the trouble and expence of travelling to *Rome* for it.

Matth. 18. 17. Heb. 13. 17. Those other Scriptures produc'd to this purpose; As, *Tell it to the Church, and if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves*, &c. are even to a prodigy impertinent: For whosoever from these and such like Texts shall infer, that any person or society of persons is infallible, he must also by the same rules of arguing conclude, that every Prince and subordinate Magistrate; yea, that every Parent and Master is so; since the Commands of God to hear and obey these, are as express and peremptory, as to hear and obey the other.

Secondly, And as the Scriptures alledg'd do not prove any Church now in being to be infallible; so much less, that the Church of *Rome* is. For what proof is this?

Christ promis'd his Apostles, that *his Spirit should lead them into all Truth*; therefore the Church of *Rome* is infallible: Is not the consequence altogether as good; therefore the Church of *England* is infallible?

Christ hath promis'd, that *the gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church.* And is not this Promise as applicable to the Church of *England*, as to the Church of *Rome*?

The Church *is the Pillar and Ground of Truth*: So was the Church of *Ephesus*, when these words were directed to *Timothy*; and so was every one of the *Asian* Churches, as long as they continu'd

continu'd Churches: and ſo is the Church of *England* now, and other reformed Churches, in a higher Senſe than the Church of *Rome* (which together with the Truth ſhe ſtill upholds, does alſo maintain ſo many Errors, that the Pillar and Ground of Error, is a Title better becoming her) and ſo will the univerſal Church be in all ſucceeding Ages.

Chriſt hath promis'd *to be with his Church to the end of the World.* But is this Promiſe limited to the Church of *Rome?* May not the Church of *England* put in as good a claim to it? And may not Chriſt be in the midſt of two or three that are gathered together in his Name in *England*, as well as in *Italy?*

But as more eſpecially relating to the Church of *Rome*, they tell us that *Chriſt pray'd for S. Peter, that his Faith might not fail.* 'Tis true; but is every Man infallible, whoſe Faith fails not? Yea, ſuppoſe Chriſt had pray'd that S. *Peter* might be infallible; does it thence follow, that the Church of *Rome* is ſo? Chriſt promis'd S. *Paul*, that *no man ſhould ſet on him to hurt him:* And it ſeems as fairly to follow from this Promiſe made to S. *Paul*, that the Church of *Rome* is infallible, as from the Prayer made for S. *Peter*. Luke 22. 32.

But S. *Peter* was that Rock Chriſt meant, when he ſaid, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church.* That's a queſtion: For S. *Chryſoſtom* underſtood by the Rock, not the Perſon but the Confeſſion of S. *Peter* (*a*); and ſo did S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and many more of the Fathers. And if the Pope be infallible, 'tis certain, that by the Rock is meant the Faith or Confeſſion of S. *Peter*; for ſo Pope *Felix* III. hath expounded it (*b*). But ſuppoſe that by *this Rock* is meant the perſon of S. *Peter*; does it follow that the Church of *Rome* is infallible? Yes, (ſay they) becauſe the Church of *Rome* was built upon him: Whether it was or no is much diſputed; but 'tis out of queſtion that the Church of *Antioch* was, and that ſome years before there was a Church at *Rome*; if therefore any privilege accrue from thence, the precedency muſt be given to *Antioch*. Matth. 16. 18.

(*a*) Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκκλησίαν, τουτέστι τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας. *In cap. 16. Matt. Hom. 55.*

(*b*) *Super iſta confeſſione, ædificabo eccleſiam meam. Epiſt. 5. apud Binium, tom. 3. p. 603. Edit. Pariſ. 1636.*

But was not S. *Paul* a Rock, and all the reſt of the Apoſtles, in the ſame Senſe that S. *Peter* was? If then a Church becomes infallible, by being founded upon a Rock, how comes it to paſs, that all the other Churches of Apoſtolical Foundation have err'd?

In brief, when they ſhall produce one Text of Scripture, that but ſo much as fairly intimates, that his Holineſs of *Rome* is not as ſubject to err, as His Grace of *Canterbury*; that a *Lateran* Council

Council is more infallible than a Convocation at *Weſtminſter*, they will produce ſomething, that is not altogether impertinent.

II. Let us now conſider, whether their Arguments from Reaſon are more concluding. 'Twill I think be ſufficient to examine that alone, which they moſt frequently inſiſt upon, and make the greateſt noiſe with; for if that ſhall be found to be of no weight, we may warrantably conclude, that all the reſt are lighter than nothing and Vanity.

Now that is taken from the ſuppoſed neceſſity of an infallible living Judge, in order to the Peace of the Church. For though the Scripture (they grant) is a Rule infallible, yet ſince Controverſies notwithſtanding frequently ariſe about the Senſe of it, by what means ſhall theſe be determin'd, and Sects and Hereſies either prevented or ſuppreſſed, if there be no infallible Interpreter of it?

Which Argument ſuppoſes theſe three things.

1. That it is neceſſary, in order to Peace, that all Controverſies which ariſe in the Church ſhould be determined.

2. That Controverſies cannot be determined without an infallible Judge.

3. That ſuch a Judge would certainly give a final Determination to them.

Neither of which Suppoſitions may be granted. For neither is it neceſſary to the Peace of the Church, that all manner of Controverſies ſhould be decided; and if it were, there may be other means by which they may be as well decided, as by an infallible Judge; and in caſe there were not, yet this Judge would not be ſo effectual to this purpoſe, as is ſuppoſed.

1. There is no neceſſity, in order to this end, that all ſorts of Controverſies ſhould be determin'd; becauſe every difference in opinion, does not neceſſarily infer the breach of Peace. How frequently do we meet with thoſe who live in Peace together, and yet are in many things different in their Judgments one from another? This the Romaniſts themſelves muſt of neceſſity grant; for they boaſt much of their own Peace and Unity, and yet all the World knows, that there are many Controverſies among themſelves, that are yet undetermin'd, and are likely ſo to remain.

Nor

Nor is this true only of particular Perſons, but the ſame is alſo verified of particular Churches; many of which maintain Peace between themſelves, notwithſtanding their different Judgments in many matters of ſmaller moment.

2. When Controverſies ariſe which really diſturb the Peace of the Church, is there no way to decide them without recourſe to an Infallible Judge? If not, then 'tis not enough that there be ſuch a Judge, but 'tis alſo neceſſary that he ſhould be clearly known: If there be, then ſuch a Judge is not neceſſary; for that means cannot be neceſſary, without which the end may be attained.

1. If Controverſies which create diſturbance to the Church cannot be determin'd without an infallible Umpire, 'tis alſo neceſſary for the determining of them, not only that there be ſuch an Umpire, but that we be aſſured who he is; for in this caſe not to be known, and not to be, are in effect the ſame thing: ſo that let there be Judges infallible never ſo many, our Controverſies will be never the nearer an end, unleſs we are able to diſcern who they are. Now I cannot imagine at preſent, how they can be known, except one of theſe two ways only; either by being clearly revealed by God in Scripture; or by God's bearing witneſs to their Infallibility by Signs and Wonders. But God hath neither expreſly, nor by evident conſequence, declared in Scripture, that he hath any where conſtituted ſuch a Judge; much leſs hath he told us who he is, and where we may find him; till therefore they who pretend to it, prove their Infallibility by unqueſtionable Miracles, let them not expect that we ſhould take them for ſuch. Nor can they in reaſon blame us for this; ſince the diſagreement in this point, is ſo great among themſelves, that of all other queſtions, it ſeems moſt to ſtand in need of an infallible Judge to determine it.

2 If Controverſies may be decided by other means, then what need of an infallible Judge? That cannot be neceſſary to an end, without which the end may be obtain'd. And that Controverſies may be otherways determin'd is certain, becauſe they have been. How were all the Controverſies decided, and the Hereſies ſuppreſs'd, which ſprang up in the early Age of the Chriſtian Church? Were the *Gnoſticks*, the *Valentinians*, the *Novatians*, the *Macedonians*, the *Donatiſts*, the *Arians* ſuppreſs'd by thoſe who took upon them to be Infallible? No ſuch thing was in thoſe days

talked of; the Biſhops and Councils that confuted them, did not ſo much as pretend to any ſuch Privilege. The only means they had recourſe to, was the infallible Rule, the Holy Scriptures; this was the Judge to which in all their Queſtions they appeal'd; and thoſe who are ſo perverſe, as not to be determin'd by it, ſhould *Elias* come and take the Chair, neither will they be determin'd by his Sentence; for nothing can be objected to render the Scripture ineffectual to this end, but the ſame may with equal force be objected againſt the Definitions of an infallible Judge. And therefore,

3. An infallible Judge is no ſuch infallible means for the ending of Controverſies, as is by the Romaniſts ſuppoſed. For,

1. When there was ſuch a Judge in the *Jewiſh* Church, (I mean our Bleſſed Saviour) Did his Authority put an end to the Diſputes between the *Phariſees* and the *Sadduces*, and other Sects among them? Yea, did not that Church then fall into the moſt damnable Error, by rejecting this infallible Teacher? 'Twill be ſaid, The reaſon of that was, becauſe they did not own his Infallibility: Be it ſo; and may not then any other infallible Guide be rejected? Can it be imagin'd, that any other Perſon's Infallibility ſhould ever be atteſted with more unqueſtionable Credentials than his was? But,

2. Neither thoſe who have been own'd for Infallible, have been ſo ſucceſsful to this purpoſe among them who have own'd them under this Character. For, 1. The Apoſtles were thought Infallible, by thoſe Churches which they planted; and yet Errors and Hereſies ſprang up in them, and they were divided into Parties. And tho' S. *Paul*, in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, had endeavour'd to reduce them to Unity; yet we find by his ſecond Epiſtle that that had not put an end to their Diviſions. Thoſe who know they have a Guide that cannot err, may go aſtray as much as others, in caſe they refuſe to follow his conduct. 2. The Romaniſts tell us, that their Church cannot err; and if they do indeed believe what they profeſs, it will be as effectual for the ending of Differences among themſelves, as if it were indeed Infallible: And yet are there not many Controverſies among them? And tho' they upbraid us with our Diviſions, are not theirs as many? And ſome of them ſuch as are by the differing Parties reckon'd even Matters of Faith? If then their Infallibility were ſuch a Sovereign Cure of Diviſions, how comes it to paſs, that no Reconciliation is made between

between the diſſenting Parties among themſelves? The truth is, ſo far is their pretended infallible Judge from leſſening, that he encreaſes their Controverſies; for no ſooner was he talked of, but inſtead of deciding thoſe that were already, many were raiſed, that were never before heard of. And therefore,

3. Such a work of the Holy Spirit upon Mens hearts, as would make them meek, and humble, and charitable, and heavenly minded, ſincere lovers of Truth, deſirous to know the Will of God, and reſolv'd to do it, would be an expedient much more available for the healing of our Diviſions, and promoting of Peace, than Infallibility of Judgment. For from whence come Wars and Fightings among us? come they not hence, even from our Luſts? Scarce ever was any Error broach'd, that created diſturbance to the Church; but 'tis manifeſt it took its riſe from, and was foſter'd and maintain'd, either by the Luſt of the Fleſh, or the Luſt of the Eye, or the Pride of Life: Let but Men's fleſhly, worldly, and deviliſh Luſts be once mortified, and our Differences will be compoſed; or if any remain, they will be ſuch, as will be deſtructive neither of Peace, nor Charity. Should we therefore argue at the ſame abſurd rate that our Adverſaries do, might we not as fairly conclude, that God hath made every Man Pious and Humble, and a Doer of his Will; as that he hath made one Man, or one Church Infallible?

But now, if that which is ſuppoſed by the Romaniſts were all granted: If it were neceſſary to the Peace of the Church, that all Controverſies ſhould be decided; if they cannot be decided without ſome infallible Umpire; and if it were certain that ſuch an Umpire would give a final determination to them; yet doth it hence follow, that the Church of *Rome* muſt be that Umpire? Suppoſe the Church of *England* were Infallible, might it not be as ſerviceable to theſe Intents and Purpoſes?

III. This pretended Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, hath as little ſupport from the Doctrine of the Ancient Chriſtian Church, as it hath from Scripture and Reaſon. Tho' the Romaniſts are wont (among thoſe who will take their word) to boaſt much of the Authority of the Fathers; yet that they are not able to produce ſo much as one, who ſpeaks to their purpoſe, may be reaſonably concluded from the Performances of Cardinal *Bellarmine* in this matter *, all whoſe Allegations are ſo impertinent, that the very reading of them may be ſufficient to ſatisfie an impartial

* Bell. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 4.

perſon, that nothing can be found in Antiquity that really favours this pretence. Yea, that the Fathers were of a contrary Judgment, and thought that the Church of *Rome* had no ſuch paramount privilege above other Churches, will afterward appear by plain and undeniable proofs.

If what the Romaniſts ſlily ſuppoſe, and make great advantage of in this Queſtion, were true, (*viz.* that the *Roman* is the Catholick Church) it would not do their work. For tho' the Catholick Church is infallibly led by the Holy Ghoſt, into all things neceſſary to be believ'd and practis'd; yet we have no aſſurance, either from Scripture or Reaſon, that ſhe ſhall not err in other matters. But that the *Roman* and Catholick are the ſame, is an opinion, not only condemn'd by the firſt Council of *Nice* (*a*), and (which is more) was wholly a ſtranger to the firſt eight General Councils (*b*), that is, unknown to the Chriſtian World for 900 years after Chriſt: But 'tis moreover as abſurd in it ſelf as to ſay that the part is equal to the whole; that the Church of *London* is the Church of *England*. And till they have prov'd the latter, we ſhall hardly be perſwaded to believe the former. In the mean time, let them take it for a favour, that we grant the Church of *Rome* to be a part of the Catholick Church, it being a part ſo miſerably corrupted.

(a) *Can.* 6.

(b) *Novem primis ſeculis, quibus octo univerſalia concilia habita ſunt, nunquam auditum aut lectum, Romanam Eccleſiam alii notione aut ſignificatione ſumptam, quam pro ſingulari & particulari Eccleſia, atque primo membro Eccleſiæ univerſalis.* Richer. l. 1. c. 13. p. 754. Colon. 1683.

I thought it needful to premiſe what hath been ſaid, becauſe when we charge the Church of *Rome* with Errors, and for proof of that charge, produce many particular Inſtances; her Advocates think it a ſufficient anſwer to tell us; alas, Sirs, you are groſly miſtaken! as for thoſe Opinions and Practices which you take to be Errors, 'tis your ſelves only that err in thinking them to be ſo; for the Church of *Rome* is ſo highly privileged, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles may as ſoon err, as ſhe. Having therefore remov'd this Obſtacle out of the way, I now proceed to that which I mainly deſign, which I ſhall compriſe under theſe following heads of Diſcourſe.

I. That the Church of *Rome*, is not only fallible, but hath actually err'd.

II. That her Errors were not ſlight, and in matters of ſmall moment; but ſo groſs and enormous when the Reformation was ſet on foot, that there was a neceſſity of reforming them.

III. That no hope was left, that the Church of *Rome*, would either

either reform these Errors in her self; or give consent to the reformation of them, in any other Church that communicated with her.

IV. That every particular national Church had a right to reform it self without her leave.

V. That this right of the Church of *England* in particular, was most unquestionable. And therefore as a necessary Conclusion from these Premisses,

VI. That the Church of *England* was indispensably bound to reform her self, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Church of *Rome*.

I. That the Church of *Rome*, not only may err, but hath actually err'd. This cannot be denied, if those in that Church have err'd, who (as they themselves assert) are the only persons that cannot err: For if their supposed infallible Guides have mistaken their way; how can it otherwise be, but that those who blindly follow them, must go astray too? Now let them place their Infallibility where they please, either in the Pope, or in a General Council, or in both united, 'tis as certain that they all have err'd, as that both parts of a contradiction cannot be true. I.

1. For their Popes; 'tis a common thing with them to rescind each others Decrees, and to make Definitions as opposite one to another, as Yea and Nay. Thus Pope *Stephen* VI. abrogated the Decrees, and null'd the Acts of *Formosus* I. (*a*). Pope *Romanus* I. did the like kindness for *Stephen* (*b*). Pope *John* X. reprobated the Acts of *Stephen*, and restor'd those of *Formosus* (*c*). Pope *Sergius* III. was so great an Abhorrer of *Formosus* and his Acts, that he compell'd those Priests who had received orders from him to be re-ordain'd; nor would he suffer his dead Body to rest, but commanding it to be taken up, set it in the Pope's Seat, adorn'd with Priestly Robes, and pass'd Sentence upon him, as if he had been alive, and then pulling off the Sacred Vestments, and cutting off the three Fingers with which he was wont to give his Blessing, commanded it to be thrown into *Tiber*, as unworthy of humane Burial (*d*). Pope *Nic.* I. decreed that it was not fit for Clergy-men to bear Arms (*e*). Pope *Urban* the II. exhorted the Bishops to fight against the *Amalekites*, *viz.* the *Turks*) (*f*), and Pope *Boniface* VIII. shewed himself to the People at the Jubilee, in an imperial Habit, and had a naked Sword carried before him.

(a) *Platina in vita Steph.*
(b) *Id. in vita Romani.*
(c) *Id. in vita Johannis* X.
(d) *Id. in vita Sergii. Luitprand. l.* 1. *de reb. Imp. & Reg. c.* 8.
(e) *Nam cum discreti sint milites seculi a militibus Ecclesiæ; non convenit militibus Ecclesiæ, militare seculo, per quod ad effusionem sanguinis necesse sit pervenire.* Gratian. Dist. 50. c. 5.
(f) *Baron. an.* 1095. *n.* 49.

Nor

Nor have they only contradicted one another, but the same Pope hath contradicted himself too. So did Pope *Vigilius* again and again in the Controversie about the three Chapters (g). So did Pope *Martin* V. he confirm'd that Decree of the Council of *Constance*, which set a General Council above the Pope, and he set the Pope above a Council, in publishing a Bull against Appeals from the Pope to a Council (h). So did *Eugenius* IV. *Paul* III. and many more.

(g) *Par. de Marca dissert. de decret. Vigilii.*
(h) *Richer. Hist. Concil. general. l. 2. c. 3. s. 21, 23, 25.*

Nor have they err'd only in points of small importance, but even in matters of Faith. Pope *Liberius* consented to the *Arian* Heresie, as S. *Athanasius* (i), S. *Hilary* (k), and S. *Jerom* (l), inform us. Pope *Honorius* defended the Heresie of the Monothelites, and was condemned for a downright Heretick by the Sixth (n), Seventh (o) and Eighth (p) General Councils. All which Councils were confirmed by Popes: The sixth by *Leo* II. the seventh by *Adrian* I. the eighth by *Adrian* II. So that if the Pope confirming a Council be infallible, 'tis certain that the Pope hath not only err'd, but hath been a Heretick: that is, 'tis certain, that he hath damnably err'd, and that 'tis impossible he should err.

(i) *In epistola ad solitariam vitam agentes* p. 837. Par.
(k) *Hæc est perfidia Ariana, Anathema tibi à me dictum, Liberi, & sociis tuis; iterum tibi Anathema, & tertio, prævaricator Liberi*, Hil. in Frag. col. 426.
(l) *In Catalogo vir. illustr.*
(n) *Richer hist. Concil. general. l. 1. c. 10. s. 23, 24.*
(o) *Id. l. 1. c. 11. s. 10.*
(p) *Id. l. 1. c. 12. s. 21.*

I shall propose two or three questions to the Romanists, the answers to which (one would think) might put an end to this Controversie; because whether they be in the affirmative or negative, they must of necessity grant, That either the ancient or modern Popes have err'd. The questions are these: *First*, Whether Pope *Gelasius* did not err, when he forbad communicating in one kind only as a grand Sacrilege (q)? *Secondly*, Whether *Pelagius* II. and *Gregory* the Great did not err, when they condemn'd the Title of universal Bishop, as prophane and Antichristian (r)? *Thirdly*, Whether Pope *Martin* V. did not err, when he confirm'd the Council of *Constance*, which determin'd that a General Council was the Pope's Superiour (s).

(q) *Comperimus autem quidam sumptâ tantummodo sacri corporis portione, à calice sacri cruoris abstineant, qui proculdubio quoniam nescio quâ superstitione docentur obstringi, aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.* Gratian. de consecrat. dist. 2. c. 12. (r) *Pelagii epist. ad Constantinopol. Synod. Episcopos.* Greg. M. lib. 6. Epist. 30. (s) *Concil. Constant sess. 4. & 5.*

Now what Arts have the Romanists to reconcile these palpable contradictions? They have a notable invention, by which *Statuimus* and *Abrogamus* do signifie the same thing, as the Glos upon

upon *Gratian* informs us they do (*t*). For that the Pope may err, and that he cannot err, may both be true: He may err as a private Doctor, he cannot err as Pope: *Hildebrand* may quite fall from the Faith, *Gregory* the Seventh cannot ſo much as trip; his Errors (whatſoever they are) are ever perſonal, never judicial. Much like that diſtinction in the late times of Rebellion, between the King's perſonal and politick Capacity, by the help of which, they fought for the King, who fought againſt *Charles Stuart*.

(t) *Statuimus*, i.e. *arrogamus. diſt.* 4. *cap. Statuimus.*

But when the Pope determines judicially, does he follow his private judgment, or does he not? If not, he defines againſt his Conſcience; he really believes one thing, and profeſſes to believe another. If he does, then in caſe it happens that he err perſonally, he muſt of neceſſity err judicially.

But when may the Pope be ſaid to err judicially, if not when he errs in making his Decrees? And ſo of neceſſity muſt one of thoſe Popes do, whoſe Decrees thwart and oppoſe each other. If ever the Pope cannot err, 'tis (as *Bellarmine* aſſerts) when he teaches the Univerſal Church, in Matters concerning Faith (*u*), and ſo did Pope *Vigilius*, when he publiſh'd his Definition concerning the three Chapters (*w*), which he himſelf afterward retracted.

(u) *Summus Pontifex cum totam Eccleſiam docet, in his quæ ad Fidem pertinent, nullo caſu errare poteſt.* Bell. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 3.

(w) *Baron. an.* 553. *n.* 208.

In brief, if the Pope could not ſin, we might then be perſwaded to grant, that he could not err, ſince a Holy Heart and Life are the beſt Diſpoſitions to a right Belief; but ſince the Popes are ſuch great Strangers to Holineſs (as they have commonly been, for a long time) who can imagine, that they, above all other Men, ſhould be ſo intimately acquainted with Truth?

2. That Councils, as general as any that have ever been, have err'd, the Romaniſts will be forc'd to grant, becauſe there are many ſuch Councils which are by themſelves reprobated (*x*). 'Tis to no purpoſe to tell us, that thoſe are ſuch as were never confirm'd or approv'd by the Pope; for if a General Council, as ſuch, is Infallible, it is ſo whether the Pope confirm it or not. Beſides, the Council hath done its work, and therefore hath err'd or not err'd, before it is confirm'd by him. In caſe therefore it hath err'd, his Confirmation cannot make it not to have err'd; if it hath not err'd, there is no need of it to that purpoſe.

(x) *Bell. de Concil.* l. 1. c. 6.

But ſome will ſay, the Popes Confirmation doth not make the Council not to have err'd, but declare it; and thereby gives aſſurance to all Perſons, that it hath not err'd. It ſeems then, that a General Council may err, or elſe what need the Pope to declare, that

that it hath not err'd? But if the Pope himſelf be not Infallible, how can I be e're the more ſure that a Council hath not err'd, becauſe the Pope approves it? And what if the Pope be an Heretick, (as *Honorius* was) can a Council be thought the more Orthodox for being confirm'd by him? Should the Council condemn his Hereſie, and vindicate the Truth, can it be ſuppoſed that he would confirm it?

But that the Pope's rejecting or approving, is no certain Argument that a Council hath err'd or not err'd, is certain; becauſe if it were, that which is Truth to day, may be Error to morrow; becauſe the ſame Council which hath at one time been condemn'd by the Pope, hath at another time been confirm'd by him: For inſtance, the Fifth General Council, which was firſt condemn'd, and afterward approved by Pope *Vigilius* (*y*).

(y) *Pet. de Marca Diſſert. de Epiſt. Vigilii.*

3. That General Councils confirm'd by the Pope, have actually err'd, is no leſs manifeſt. For, 1. They have made Decrees, ſo apparently contradictory to the plain Words and Senſe of Holy Scripture, that no impartial Perſon can any more queſtion it, than he can, whether Theft be forbidden by the Eighth Commandment. So did the Council of *Conſtance*, confirm'd by Pope *Martin* V. and the Council of *Trent*, confirm'd by Pope *Pius* IV. The former in the Decree for Laicks communicating in one kind only, notwithſtanding (as themſelves acknowledge) that Chriſt inſtituted the Sacrament in both kinds, and deliver'd it in both to his Diſciples (*z*); The latter in decreeing, that the Divine Service ſhould not be in the vulgar Tongue (*a*), in plain contradiction to what S. *Paul* preſcribes in the fourteenth Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. 2. General Councils confirm'd by Popes, have made Definitions and Decrees plainly contradictory one to the other. The Sixth General Council was confirm'd by Pope *Adrian* I. the Council of *Trent* by Pope *Pius* IV. The former defin'd, that Marriage was diſſolv'd by Hereſie (*b*); the latter, that it was not (*c*). The Council of *Conſtance* confirm'd by Pope *Martin* V. decreed, that a General Council was ſuperior to the Pope (*d*); the laſt *Lateran* Council condemn'd this Decree (*e*). 3. A General Council confirm'd by one Pope, hath been condemn'd by a General Council, confirm'd by another: As the Council of *Baſil* confirm'd by Pope *Nicolas* V. was eſteemed a Schiſmatical and Seditious Conventicle, and reprobated by the laſt *Lateran* Council, confirm'd by Pope *Leo* X. (*f*), which at *Rome*

(z) *Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ.* 13.
(a) *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 8.
(b) *Canon.* 72.
(c) *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 24. *Can.* 5.
(d) *Seſſ.* 4. & 5.
(e) *Concil. Lateran. Seſſ.* 11.
(f) *Binii notis in Concil. Conſtantien. Bell. de Concil. Auct.* l. 2. c. 17.

is

is accounted a General Council. So that unleſs Errors become Truth, and Contradictions be reconciled when determin'd by a Pope and Council, we may conclude, that not only the Pope himſelf, but a General Council confirm'd by him hath err'd.

It plainly appears by what hath been ſaid, that thoſe have actually err'd, whom the Church of *Rome* ſuppoſes to be her only infallible Guides: From whence it unavoidably follows, that the Church of *Rome* hath err'd; Firſt, In all thoſe Points, which have been erroneouſly defin'd by them; Secondly, In ſuppoſing them to be Infallible.

I ſhall not ſtay to ſhew, of what uſe Councils, either General or Provincial, are; how far their Authority extends, and what great Benefit may accrue to the Church by them, tho' they be ſuppos'd not to be Infallible: But ſhall proceed to the next Propoſition, *viz.*

II. That the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, were not ſlight, and in matters of ſmall moment; but ſo groſs and enormous, when the Reformation was ſet on foot, that there was a neceſſity of reforming them. This will be evident, II.

Firſt, By unqueſtionable Teſtimonies.

Secondly, By taking a particular view of the Errors themſelves.

Firſt, By Teſtimonies of unqueſtionable Authority; of Perſons who could neither be miſtaken through Ignorance, nor byaſs'd by Intereſt or Affection, to repreſent Matters worſe than indeed they were: But who were on the contrary, as well acquainted with the State of the *Roman* Church, as any Perſons in the World; who were promoted to the greateſt Honours in it; whoſe worldly Intereſts ingaged them above all other Men to maintain its Reputation and Authority; and who not only liv'd, but died in Communion with it. Such were their learned Doctors, their Biſhops and Cardinals, their Princes and Emperors, their Popes and General Councils; tho' the two laſt are not to be reckon'd for ſingle Witneſſes, but for the Voice of their Church; the one being their Church Repreſentative; the other (according to their Divinity) their Church Virtual. Of thoſe many which offer themſelves, I ſhall content my ſelf to produce a few; and thoſe ſhall be ſuch as were either cotemporary with, or who liv'd within about a hundred years of the Reformation, paſſing over thoſe who were at a greater diſtance from it.

John Gerſon, the renowned Chancellor of *Paris*, in a Sermon to the Council of *Conſtance*, applies to the modern Church of *Rome*, theſe words of the Prophet *Ezekiel*: *Thou didſt truſt in thine own beauty, and plaiedſt the Harlot, becauſe of thy renown; and pour'dſt out thy Fornications on every one that paſs'd by. And in all thy Abominations, thou hadſt not remember'd the days of thy youth. Thou haſt built thy brothel houſe at every head of the way, and haſt made thy beauty to be abhorr'd. Behold therefore I will deliver thee into the hands of thoſe that hate thee.* And after he had told them, what were the ſad Symptoms of approaching Ruine, he adviſes them to a great and notable Reformation of Manners, as the only means to prevent it (*a*). And becauſe, ſaith he, ſome may ſay, that the Church is founded upon a Rock, and therefore in no danger of ruine; He declares more particularly, what were thoſe Enormities, in which the Churchmen eſpecially needed to be reform'd, and then exhorts the Council, *either to reform all Eſtates of the Church in a General Council, or command them to be reform'd in Provincial Synods; that by their Authority the Church might be repaired, and the Houſe of God purg'd from all Uncleanneſs, Vices and Errors* (*b*).

(a) John Gerſon *Serm. de ſignis ruinæ Eccleſiæ.*

(b) *Declarat. Defect. viror. Eccleſiaſt.*

The ſame Author earneſtly preſs'd Pope *Alexander* V. to ſet himſelf to reform thoſe Corruptions and Abuſes, which (as he ſays) were the Plague of the Church, and without the removal of which, 'twas in vain to expect Peace (*c*).

(c) *Serm. coram Alexand. in die Aſcenſ. Domini.*

Nic. Clemangis, another Pariſian Doctor, writ ſeveral Books upon this Subject, in which he repreſents to the World, the deplorable State of the *Roman* Church, and the neceſſity of Reforming it (*d*).

(d) *De Corrupto Statu Eccleſiæ, & de Reparatione & Ruinâ Eccleſ.*

Add to theſe ſingle Teſtimonies, the ſolemn Appeal of the whole Univerſity of *Paris*, from Pope *Leo* X. to a General Council, in defence of the Pragmatick Sanction. In which they ſet forth, how that the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* made many Decrees, eſpecially about the Reformation of the Eccleſiaſtical State, as well in the Head as in the Members, which in thoſe days eſpecially, ſeem'd to ſtand in need of Reformation. *And how among other things, the Sacred Council of* Baſil *conſider'd, how by the ancient Fathers, Sacred Canons and wholſome Decrees were made for the happy Government of the Eccleſiaſtical State, which as long as they were obſerv'd, the vigour of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline continued, Religion, Piety and Charity flouriſh'd. But after that Men through Ambition and Covetouſneſs, began to contemn the Decrees of the Holy Fathers, there follow'd Deformi-*

ties

ties in the Church, many of which they afterwards enumerate, and then appeal from the Pope to a future General Council (*e*). And 'tis obſervable, that this Appeal was made in the year 1517. the very ſame year in which *Luther* began to preach againſt the horrible Abuſes of Indulgences.

(e) *Faſcic. rerum expetend. ac fugiend. Richer. Hiſt. Concil. General. l.* 4. *part* 2. *p.* 84.

If we paſs on to Biſhops and Archbiſhops, tho' their Intereſt ingag'd them more ſtrongly to oppoſe it, yet we ſhall find ſeveral even among them, who were ſo ſenſible of the neceſſity of Reformation, that they earneſtly call'd for it, and endeavour'd to promote it.

Frederick Archbiſhop of *Salerno*, *Jerome* Archbiſhop of *Brunſwick*, and *Joh. Matth. Gibertus* Biſhop of *Verona*, plainly declar'd, that they had a great Senſe of the Corruptions of the Church, by the Articles of Reformation, which (together with the reſt of the Select Council) they deliver'd to Pope *Paul* III. (*f*).

(f) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. General l.* 4. *part* 2. *p.* 136.

In a Book Intitled, *Onus Eccleſiæ*, written by *John* Suffragan Biſhop of *Saltzburgh*, in the year 1519. (that is, but two years after *Luther* began the Reformation) we have for many Chapters together, a moſt direful Deſcription of the corrupt State of the Church (*g*).

(g) *Onus Eccleſiæ. c.* 19, 20, 21, &c.

In the Council of *Trent* the Biſhop of *Conimbria* ſaid, *For theſe* 150 *years the World hath demanded a Reformation in the Head and the Members, and hitherto hath been deceived; that now it was time they ſhould labour in earneſt, and not by Diſſimulation* (*h*). And *Dudithius* an *Hungarian* Biſhop, pray'd the *Hungarians* and *Polonians*, *That for God's ſake, and for the Charity every Chriſtian oweth to the Church, they would not abandon ſo honeſt, juſt and profitable a Cauſe, but that every one would put down in writing, what he thought might be conſtituted for the Service of God, without any reſpect of Man, not reforming one part, but the whole Body of the Church, in the Head and the Members* (*i*).

(h) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 6. *p.* 568.

(i) P. 588.

If from Biſhops we aſcend to Cardinals; tho' to their Pride and Luxury, and Pomp and Grandeur, nothing could give a greater blow, than a due Reformation; yet to ſuch a wretched State was the Church reduced, that many of them, did not only acknowledge the neceſſity of Reforming it, but in ſome meaſure contributed their endeavours toward it.

Gaſpar Cardinal *Contarene*, *John Peter* Cardinal *Theatine*, *James* Cardinal *Sadolete*, and *Reginald Pool* Cardinal of *England*, were of the number of the Select Council, that preſented the Articles of Reformation to Pope *Paul* III. (*k*).

(k) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. General. l* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 156.

The College of Cardinals at the death of *Alexander* VI. before they entred the Conclave for the Election of a new Pope, took an Oath, that if any of them ſhould be choſen, he ſhould immediately before the Publication of his Election, bind himſelf under pain of Perjury and a Curſe, to call a Council within two years for the Reformation of the Church (*l*), which Oath was taken by *Julius* II. (*m*), who was choſen Pope; and when it appear'd afterward, that he made no conſcience of keeping it (ſeven years having paſs'd without any mention of a Council) in the year 1511. nine Cardinals who had withdrawn themſelves from *Rome*, by reaſon of his Inſolencies, by the aſſiſtance of the Emperor *Maximilian*, and *Lewis* XII. King of *France*, call'd the Second *Piſan* Council to that purpoſe (*n*). *Petrus de Alliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray*, wrote a Book for the Reformation of the Church (*o*); and *Ludovicus* Cardinal of *Arles*, who preſided in the Council of *Baſil*, zealouſly endeavoured it. The Cardinals who call'd the firſt *Piſan* Council, to extinguiſh the Schiſm rais'd by the two Anti-Popes, *Benedict* XIII. and *Gregory* XII. vow'd, that they would to the utmoſt of their power procure, that he that ſhould be choſen Pope, ſhould reform the Church; and that till a due and ſufficient Reformation of the univerſal Church was made, as well in the Head as in the Members, he ſhould not ſuffer the Council to be diſſolv'd (*p*).

(l) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. General.* l. 4. part. 1. c. 2.
(m) Id. l. 4. part 1. c. 3. p. 334.
(n) Id.
(o) *Faſcic. rerum expetend. ac fugiend.*
(p) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. General.* l. 2. p. 102.

Tho' the Teſtimonies already produc'd are beyond Exception, yet behold greater Witneſſes than theſe; I mean Popes themſelves, who above all Men in the World abhorr'd all Propoſals of Reformation, as that which would throw them down from their uſurp'd Dominion, and put a ſtop to their lawleſs Tyrannies. To ſuch an Exceſs were the *Romiſh* Corruptions grown, and ſo evident was the neceſſity of reforming them, that they were forc'd to confeſs it, who moſt deſir'd to deny it.

To this purpoſe *Paul* III. appointed a ſelect Council of Prelates, to collect thoſe Abuſes which were moſt Notorious and Pernicious, and preſent them to him, that he might correct them (*q*). Pope *Marcellus* II. ſaid, that he reſolv'd to make a ſevere and intire Reformation, but died before he could let the World know, whether he intended to be as good as his word (*r*). *Paul* IV. who ſucceeded him, promiſed to reform not verbally but really, the Head, Members, Clergy, Laity, Princes and People (*ſ*). *Alexander* V. as ſoon as he was choſen by

(q) Id. l. 4. part 2. p. 136.
(r) *Hiſt. Counc. of* Trent. l. 5.
(ſ) *Hiſt. Counc. of* Trent. l. 5.

by the *Piſan* Council, promiſed to ſet himſelf to the Work, and to chuſe good and learned Men out of every Nation to conſult with the Cardinals about it (*t*). Pope *Adrian* VI. was free and ingenuous in confeſſing the abominable Corruptions of the Church, and eſpecially of the Court of *Rome*, and profeſſed that he took the Papacy upon him, to the end that he might reform the univerſal Church (*u*).

What Teſtimony of greater Authority can be deſired, than theſe already mentioned, unleſs it be the concurrent voice of the Church repreſentative, in a General Council? To which I now proceed.

The firſt *Piſan* Council (as it is commonly reckoned, though it was indeed the ſecond) were reſolved to reform the Church; which *Alexander* V. (as was ſaid before) who was choſen by, and preſided in that Council, promiſed to aſſiſt them in (*w*). The Council of *Conſtance*, which followed five Years after, decreed, That the Pope which was then to be choſen, ſhould together with the Council, or thoſe which ſhould be deputed by the ſeveral Nations, reform the Church, before the Council ſhould be diſſolved; and the matters about which it was thought fit the Reformation ſhould be made, were reduced to eighteen Heads (*x*). In the Council of *Baſil*, the Pope gave his Legate full power of concluding all ſuch things as appertained to the reformation of the Eccleſiaſtical State (*y*). And whereas there were ſix things which that Council reſolved mainly to proſecute; two of them were theſe, 1. That the Church ſhould be reformed in the Head and Members. 2. That the ancient Diſcipline, as much as poſſible, ſhould be reſtored (*z*). The ſecond Council at *Piſa* declared, That the reformation of the Church was moſt neceſſary, and paſſed this Decree upon it: That the Holy Synod would not, nor could diſſolve it ſelf, till the Univerſal Church ſhould be reformed, both in Faith and Manners, as well in the Head as in the Members (*a*). Where it is obſervable, That the Reformation decreed by this Council, as ſo highly neceſſary, did extend to Faith, as well as to Manners: And ſo did alſo that which was required by many other great Men of the *Roman* Communion, as ſhall be afterward ſhewed, when I deſcend to particulars.

It cannot be expected, that I ſhould aſcend higher in the Eccleſiaſtical State, ſince a General Council is the higheſt Authority of

(t) *Concil. Piſan. ſeſſ.* 21. *apud Richer.*
(u) *Sleidan. Comment. l.* 4. *Richer. Hiſt. Concil general. l.* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 129. *Faſcic. rerum expetend. &c. f.* 173.
(w) *Concil. Piſan. ſeſſ.* 17. & 21. *apud Richerium; apud Binium, ſeſſ.* 16. & 20.
(x) *Concil. Conſtant. ſeſſ.* 40.
(y) *Concil. Baſil. ſeſſ.* 1. *Bin.*
(z) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. general. l.* 3. *c.* 2.
(a) *Seſſ.* 3. *apud Richerium, l.* 4. *par.* 1. *p.* 430.

of the Church on Earth; by which we ſee the neceſſity of a Reformation is confirmed; and that not by one ſingle Council only, but by four ſucceſſively; three of which were confirmed by Popes; The firſt *Piſan* by *Alexander* V. the Council of *Conſtance* by *Martin* V. the Council of *Baſil* by *Nicolas* V. and ſo much of it as concerned the Reformation (and much more) by *Eugenius* IV. who was depoſed by it. If therefore a General Council, confirmed by the Pope, cannot err, it is infallibly certain, and (according to the Principles of the Church of *Rome*) an Article of Faith, That the Reformation of the Church was neceſſary.

Should we now paſs from the Clergy to the Laity; from Biſhops, Cardinals, Popes and Councils, to Secular States, Kings and Emperors, we ſhould find, That they were alſo highly ſenſible of the Corruptions and Abuſes, Uſurpations and Oppreſſions of the Church of *Rome*, and many of them zealous and active in their endeavours to reform them.

What great complaints were made, by many of our Kings of *England*, againſt the Encroachments of *Rome*? How often did they petition the Pope for a redreſs? but finding no relief from thence, *Edward* the Third, and *Richard* the Second, did in part right themſelves and their Subjects, by the Statutes of *Proviſoes* and *Præmunire* *.

* 27 *Edw* 3. *c.* 1. & 25 *Edw.* 3. 16 *Rich.* 2. *c.* 5. & 13 *R.* 2. *c.* 3. See *Cook* upon theſe Statutes, *Inſtitut par.* 3. *c.* 56.

Charles VII. King of *France*, as a Fence to the *French* Church againſt the Miſchiefs which flowed from the Court of *Rome*, ſet up the pragmatick Sanction, which when Pope *Pius* II. endeavoured to overthrow, he appealed from him to a General Council (*b*). *Lewis* XI. was indeed decoyed by the Popes fair Promiſes to revoke that Sanction; but ſoon after ſeeing his error, he commanded it again to be obſerved *. After the death of *Lewis*, the three Eſtates of the Kingdom, aſſembled at *Tours*, beſought *Charles* VIII. who ſucceeded him, to maintain the Pragmatick in its full ſtrength †: Which he not only conſented to, but reſolved to make a further progreſs in reforming the Church, and to that purpoſe conſulted the College of Divines at *Paris* (*c*). *Lewis* XII. who followed next; coyned his Mony with this Inſcription, *Perdam Babylonis*

(h) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. general. l.* 4. *par.* 1. *c.* 1. *p.* 36, 37, &c.

* *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. general. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *ſ.* 13.

† *Id. ſ.* 15.

(c) *Id. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

Babylonis nomen, I will deſtroy the name of Babylon (*d*): by which he plainly declared, what his Judgment then was of *Rome*. (d) *Thuani Hiſt. l. 1. p. 11.*

The zeal of *Sigiſmund* the Emperour for the Reformation was abundantly manifeſt, by his indefatigable pains in procuring the Council of *Conſtance*, and aſſiſting in it: By protecting the Council of *Baſil* againſt the attempts of *Eugenius*, and by labouring with other Princes to promote it; but eſpecially by that Reformation he made in many things himſelf. *Maximilian* I. made bitter Complaints of many ſcandalous Abuſes of the *Roman* Court, and commanded the redreſs of them under pain of his heavy diſpleaſure (*g*). The Emperor *Ferdinand* propoſed to the Council of *Trent*, by his Embaſſadors, twenty Points concerning Worſhip, Manners and Diſcipline, which he deſired might be reformed (*h*); and in a Letter to the Pope, and another to his Legates in the Council, earneſtly preſſed for an effectual Reformation (*i*). (g) *Faſcic. rerum expetend. ac fugiend. f.* 170. (h) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 6. *p.* 513. (i) *L.* 7. *p.* 682.

The Princes of *Germany*, at the Diet at *Nuremberg*, in the Year 1523. in their Anſwer to *Cheregat* the Pope's *Nuncio*, inſiſted upon the reforming of Abuſes, and correcting of many Errors and Vices, which by long tract of time had taken deep root; for the effecting of which, they demanded a free and general Council. And thoſe intolerable burdens (as they called them) laid upon them by the Court of *Rome*, they reduced to an hundred Heads (*), which they called the Hundred Grievances of the *German* Nation, and preſented them to the Pope, proteſting that they neither would nor could endure them any longer. (*) *Sleid. com. l.* 4. *Faſcic. rerum expetend. ac fugiend.*

To conclude this Head; to ſo monſtrous a deformed ſtate, was the Weſtern Church degenerated, that the Prince, the Prieſt, the Clergy, the Laity; Men of all Conditions, and of all Nations: Yea, (if the infallible Oracle, Pope *Adrian* the Sixth, ſpoke truth) the whole World groaned after a Reformation (*k*). Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 1. (k) *Richer. l.* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 130.

Secondly, The neceſſity of which will be further evident, by taking a particular view of the Corruptions and Errors themſelves, which for methods ſake, and to avoid confuſion, ſhall be reduced to four general Heads:

1. Corruptions in Doctrine, *p.* 24.
2. In Worſhip, *p.* 38
3. In Manners, *p.* 53.
4. In Diſcipline.

In

In treating of which it will plainly appear, that their Errors were not ſmall, and of light importance; but ſo groſs, and in matters of ſuch high moment, that there was an abſolute neceſſity of reforming them.

1. Groſs Corruptions in Doctrine. Many Doctrines were impoſed as Articles of Faith, which have not the leaſt Foundation in Scripture, Reaſon or Primitive Antiquity; and many others, which are not only Strangers to all theſe, but contrary to the common ſenſe and Experience of Mankind. I ſhall inſtance in ſome of them.

(1.) The Infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*. We have before ſeen, that this Doctrine hath no Foundation in Scripture (and by conſequence can be no Article of Faith): Yea that there is no pretence of Reaſon, why the Biſhop and Church of *Rome* ſhould be infallible, rather than the Biſhop and Church of *Conſtantinople*; and all thoſe fine flouriſhes they are wont to make, of the expediency of this Doctrine, for the ending of Controverſies, and the ſafe conducting of Souls to Heaven, may be as well accounted for, by making the Church of *England*, or any other Church infallible.

That no ſuch Doctrine was owned by the ancient Church, we may be aſſured; both becauſe the Fathers in thoſe many Hereſies, which in their times aroſe, never betook themſelves to this eaſie and compendious remedy for the ſuppreſſing of them, but choſe the more tedious and laborious way of confuting them by Scripture, by Reaſon and Catholick Tradition; and becauſe the *Aſian* and *African* Biſhops, did in ſome Points ſo reſolutely diſſent from the *Roman* Biſhop and Church, that they choſe rather to break Communion, than to comply with them therein.

Had any ſuch thing in thoſe days been believed, would the *African*, *Illyrican* and *Dalmatian* Biſhops, have renounced Communion with *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Rome*, for conſenting to the condemnation of the three Chapters(*a*)? Would the bleſſed *Polycarpus* have diſſented from Pope *Anicetus*? *Irenæus* from Pope *Victor*? S. *Cyprian* from Pope *Stephen*? Can any Man who is not forſaken of his Reaſon, imagine, That ſuch Men as theſe, would have behaved themſelves ſo towards the Pope as they did, had they not thought themſelves as infallible Judges as he?

(a) *Petrus de Marca diſſertat. de Epiſt. Vigilii, ſ. 8.*

But

But what need I contend for this, when ſuch great men of the Church of *Rome*, as *Gerſon* Chancellor of *Paris*, *Almain*, *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, yea Pope *Adrian* VI. himſelf teach us (as even *Bellarmine* himſelf acknowledges) (*b*) that the Pope may not only err, but be a Heretick, yea, and teach Hereſie too, if he define without a General Council? And when a General Council ſays, 'tis certain the Pope may err (*c*)? And what that Council ſays of the Pope, is experimentally verified of a Council confirm'd by the Pope, (as hath been before prov'd).

(b) *Bell. de Rom. Pontif.* l. 4. c. 2.

(c) *Concilii Baſil. Reſponſ. Synodal. de Authorit. Concil. General. ſupra Pap.* Richer. l. 3. *c.* 2. S. 6.

Nor is this Doctrine to be rejected, meerly becauſe it is notoriouſly falſe; but more eſpecially becauſe of its horrid Conſequences, as it opens the door to, and gives protection to any other the moſt palpable Error, both in Doctrine and Practice. For if this be once granted, there is no remedy, but we muſt believe Darkneſs to be Light, if the Church of *Rome* ſays it is ſo. Yea, a *Thomas Becket*, a *Garnet*, or any other the moſt execrable Traitor, muſt be worſhipt for a Saint, when the Pope is pleas'd to canonize him.

(2.) Their Doctrine of the Popes ſovereign Power over the univerſal Church: That every Chriſtian under pain of Damnation, is bound to be ſubject to him; that no Appeals may be made from him; that he alone is the ſupream Judge over all Perſons, in all Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical, but that he himſelf can be judged by no man.

This Doctrine hath not only been defin'd by Popes themſelves, (as well as their Flatterers) and many hundreds of years together put in execution by them; but hath moreover been eſtabliſh'd by ſuch Councils as are by the Romaniſts accounted General (*d*). And yet is not only deſtitute of all Authority from Scripture, but much may be found in Scripture againſt it; And not only in Scripture, but 'tis plain from Church Hiſtory, that the Biſhops of *Rome*, in the early Ages of Chriſtianity, had no Juriſdiction beyond their own Province; that for the firſt 300 years, there were but two only, *viz. Victor* and *Stephen*, that took upon them to cenſure Perſons that were of another Dioceſs, and that they themſelves were ſeverely cenſured for it by other Biſhops; That the eight firſt General Councils, were all both call'd and confirm'd, not by Popes, but by the Emperors (*e*); That the Pope hath been oppos'd in many Councils, and many Synodical Decrees have been paſs'd

(d) *Concil. Florent.* p. 854. tom. 8. *apud Binium Concil. Lateranenſ.* V. Seſſ. 11.

(e) *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. general.* l. 1. c. 13. p. 753. *Review of the Council of* Trent. l. 3 c. 1. & 2.

full ſore againſt his will (*f*); That he himſelf was ſubject to the Laws of the Church and upon his tranſgreſſion of them, obnoxious to cenſure, no leſs than other Biſhops; That no Appeals were allow'd to him by the *African* Biſhops; That by the ancient Canons every Biſhop did order the Affairs of his own Dioceſs, without dependence upon, or Subordination to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that all Cauſes were finally to be determin'd by Provincial Councils (*g*). That many Popes have been anathematiz'd by other Biſhops, and many judg'd, condemn'd, and depos'd by Synods. All which, and many more things which might be mention'd, are plainly inconſiſtent with this pretended univerſal Empire of the Pope.

(f) As in the Council of *Chalcedon*, the ſecond at *Conſtantinople*, the Council of *Conſtance*, of *Baſil*, &c.

(g) *Concil. Conſtantinopol.* 1 Can. 2. *Concil. Nicæn.* 1 Can. 5.

But if nothing could be alleg'd from Scripture, or the Doctrine or Practice of the ancient Church to the contrary; yet the intolerable Evils which unavoidably flow from it, cannot but render this Doctrine deteſtable, to all thoſe who have any ſincere Love, either to Truth or Goodneſs. For where-ever this Doctrine is receiv'd, a Man muſt think himſelf in duty bound to, to entertain Error, and to reject the Truth; put Virtue for Vice, and Vice for Virtue, in caſe the Pope require him ſo to do. And that the Pope not only may, but for many Ages hath commanded Men ſo to do; the ſad experience of the Chriſtian World, is a proof too unanſwerable.

(3.) The Doctrine of the Popes Dominion over temporal Princes. That if Kings and Emperors oppoſe themſelves to him, or turn Hereticks, he may depoſe them, abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and give away their Kingdoms to whomſoever he pleaſes. This exorbitant Power hath been challenged by the Pope for many ſucceſſive Ages (*h*); And when opportunity hath ſerv'd, hath been frequently put in practice by them. So *Gregory* VII. excommunicated the Emperor *Henry* IV. and gave away his Kingdoms to *Rudolphus* Duke of *Schwaben* *. *Gregory* IX. excommunicated the Emperor *Frederick* II. and abſolv'd his Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance (*i*). Pope *Paul* III. excommunicated and depoſed *Henry* VIII. King of *England*, and commanded all his Subjects, under pain of a Curſe, to withdraw their Obedience from him (*k*). Pope *Pius* V. and *Gregory* XIII. damn'd and depos'd Q. *Eli-*

(h) *Dictates* of *Greg.* VII. *Dictate* 9. That all Princes ſhould kiſs the Popes Feet. *Dictate* 12. That the Pope may depoſe the Emperor. *Dictate* 27. That he may abſolve the Subjects of wicked Princes from their Allegiance. *Binius tom.* 7. *part* 1. *p.* 362. *Richer. l.* 1. *c.* 13.

* *Baron.* an. 1080. n. 8. & 12.

(i) *Bullarium Rom.* Tom. 1. p. 89, 90.

(k) *Bullar. Rom.* Tom. 1 p 514.

zabeth

zabeth, and absolv'd her Subjects from their Allegiance (*m*). This Doctrine and Practice has been defended by their learned Cardinals *Baronius* and *Perron*, by their School-men, Canonists, and by the whole order of Jesuits. Yea, 'tis no more than what was decreed by divers such Councils, as are generally own'd for lawful Representatives of their Church; As by the third *Lateran* Council under Pope *Alexander* III. (*n*); And by the fourth *Lateran* Council under Pope *Innocent* III. (*o*). And tho' some Romanists are now asham'd to own it; yet no less a Man than *Lessius* tells us, that if Kings may not be deposed by the Pope, then of necessity, must the General Council of *Lateran* have err'd.

(m) *Camden's Elizabeth.*

(n) Cap. 27. *Relaxatos autem se noverint à debito Fidelitatis*, &c.

(o) *Si vero Dominus temporalis requisitus & monitus ab Ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit*, &c. —— *Eadem nihilominus lege servata circa eos, qui non habent Dominos principales*, c. 3.

But what can be more manifest, than that this Doctrine is contradictory to the Holy Scripture? Which tells us in expres terms, that the King is Supreme (*q*), and commands every Soul to be subject to the highest civil Powers (*r*). Nothing can be more repugnant to the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers, who taught that the Emperor was the Supreme Power on Earth, that he was subject to God only, and that all other Persons were put in subjection under him (*s*); that neither Prophet, nor Evangelist, no, nor Apostle (and therefore not S. *Peter* himself) was exempt from subjection to him (*t*).

(q) 1 *Epist. Pet.* 2. 13.

(r) *Rom.* 13. 1.

(s) *Tertull. Apolog.* c. 30. *& ad Scapulam*, c. 2.

(t) *S. Chrysost. ad Rom.* c. 13. v. 1.

And such as their Doctrine was, such was their Practice; tho' their Emperors were Idolaters, and implacable Enemies to the Name of Christ, yet they thought it not in the Popes Power, to set them loose from subjection to them; Nor did any Pope in those days pretend to such a Power; And therefore they chose rather to die, when they had the greatest Provocations to resist; and when the number of the Christians was so great, that they were able, with ease, to have vanquish'd their Enemies (*u*).

(u) *Cyprian. ad Demetrianum.*

(w) *Greg. M.* Ep. 2. 62.

'Tis a Doctrine that is contrary to the Confessions and Practice of the ancient Bishops of *Rome*, who took the Emperor for their Lord and Master, and yielded themselves his most humble and obedient Servants and Subjects. So did Pope *Gregory* the Great (*w*), and before, Pope *Gelasius* I. (*x*); and after him Pope *Agatho* †. In short, 'tis a Doctrine that involves the highest Impiety against God, the greatest Injustice toward Men; that subverts the Foundations

(x) *Gelasii* Ep. 8.

† *Epist. ad Constantinum Imp. Actione* 4. *Syn.* 6. *Vide etiam Richerium Hist. Concil. General.* l. 1. c. 10. S. 5, 6.

dations of Government, and is inconſiſtent with humane Society; No man can recount the Uſurpations and Rapines, the Perjuries and Murders, the Treaſons and Rebellions, the Confuſions and Deſolations it hath caus'd in the World.

(4.) The next Inſtance ſhall be, that which was likewiſe decreed by the Fourth *Lateran* Council *, *viz.* the monſtrous Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: For the belief of which, there is no better ground in Scripture, than that the Church is tranſubſtantiated, or that the Rock in the Wilderneſs was ſubſtantially chang'd into Chriſt; becauſe the Church is call'd Chriſt's Body (*y*), and 'tis ſaid, that the Rock which follow'd the *Iſraelites* was Chriſt (*z*). But becauſe 'tis confeſs'd by many of their own learned Writers, we may therefore take it for granted, that this Doctrine cannot be prov'd by Scripture: Yea, that it is contrary to it, is manifeſt; becauſe we find in Scripture, that the Sacramental Elements, after the words of Conſecration were paſs'd, are call'd the Bread and the Cup, as they were before (*a*). And if we may believe our Saviour, the Wine after it was conſecrated, and made the Blood of the New Teſtament, was no other for ſubſtance, than the Fruit of the Vine; for after he had ſaid, *This is my Blood of the New Teſtament*; he adds, *But I ſay unto you, that I will not henceforth drink of the Fruit of the Vine*, &c. (*b*). That the Fathers for ſeven hundred years after Chriſt, believ'd the Elements, after Conſecration, to remain the ſame for ſubſtance, is beyond all contradiction prov'd, by many Proteſtant Writers; particularly in two ſhort Diſcourſes, lately written upon this Subject (*i*). And that the Popes themſelves were of the ſame Belief in the fifth Century, is evident: *For ſurely*, ſays Pope *Gelaſius*, *the Sacraments we receive of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, are a Divine thing, for which reaſon we are alſo by them made Partakers of a Divine Nature; and yet the ſubſtance or Nature of Bread and Wine does not ceaſe to be* (*k*).

* Cap. 1.

(*y*) *Epheſ.* 1. 23.

(*z*) 1 *Corinth.* 10. 4.

(*a*) 1 *Corinth.* 11. 26, 27, 28.

(*b*) *Matth.* 26. 29.

(*i*) Letter to Lady *T.* Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantion.

(*k*) *Certe Sacramenta quæ ſumimus Corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti divina res eſt, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur conſortes naturæ: & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura panis & vini. De duab. nat. in Chriſto.* Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 4.

Yea, ſo far was Tranſubſtantiation, from being the Doctrine of the Primitive Church; that we can meet with nothing like it till near the end of the eighth Century; and tho' as ſoon as it was ſtarted, it was vigorouſly oppos'd, by the moſt learned men of that time; yet by the help of the deplorable Ignorance and Superſtition,

perſtition, of that and the two next ſucceeding Ages, it was, by ſlow degrees, nurs'd up, and brought to its full growth; till at length it came to be eſtabliſh'd for an Article of Faith, in the *Lateran* Council under Pope *Innocent* III. in the year 1215.

Nor is it only deſtitute of the Authority of Scripture, and the ancient Church; but plainly deſtructive of our whole Religion, by ſubverting the main Foundation, upon which it ſtands. For if that be indeed the Fleſh of a Man, which we ſee, and feel, and taſte to be Bread; what aſſurance can we have, that there ever was any ſuch Man in the World as *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*? or that he ever wrought one Miracle in it? The certainty of which, depends upon the certainty of our Senſes; and therefore S. *John* appeals to them, as the great unqueſtionable Proofs of the Truth of our Religion (*a*). We have therefore the ſame Aſſurance that Tranſubſtantiation is Falſe, as that the Goſpel of Chriſt is True.

(*a*) 1 *Epiſt. John* 1. 1,2,3.

Nor is it more oppoſite to Senſe, than Reaſon; the belief of it implying ten thouſand Contradictions. To which we may add, the horrible Impieties it involves. That the glorified Body of our Saviour, ſhould be contracted to the crum of a Wafer; that he ſhould be perfectly depriv'd of Senſe and Reaſon; that he ſhould not be able to defend himſelf againſt the Aſſaults of the moſt contemptible Vermin; that he ſhould be ſwallow'd down whole, and if the Stomach of the Communicant chance to be foul, or over-charg'd with Wine, that he ſhould be vomited up again: Good God! what man, who is not quite forſaken of Religion, Reaſon and Senſe; who is not himſelf tranſubſtantiated into ſomething below either Man or Beaſt, can believe theſe things?

(5.) That the Marriage of Prieſts is unlawful. This Doctrine the Church of *Rome* borrow'd from the antient Hereticks; eſpecially from the *Manichees*, who allow'd Marriage to their Hearers, as the Church of *Rome* doth to Lay-men; but forbad it to their Elect (*a*), as that Church doth to her Prieſts.

(*a*) *Hic non dubito vos eſſe clamaturos invidiamque facturos, caſtitatem perfectam vos vehementer commendare atque laudare, non tamen nuptias prohibere; quandoquidem Auditores veſtri quorum apud vos ſecundus eſt gradus, ducere atque habere non prohibentur uxores.* Aug. de moribus Manichæorum. l. 2. c. 18.

The

The first Pope we read of that condemned the Marriage of Priests, was *Siricius*, almost four hundred Years after Christ, though he seems by his Epistles (if they are indeed his); rather to dissuade Priests from it, than peremptorily to forbid it (*b*). Pope *Calixtus* II. absolutely forbad Priests Marriage, and in case they were married, commanded them to be separated (*c*). Pope *Innocent* III. pronounced such Marriages null, and the Council of *Trent* anathematizes those who say they are valid (*d*).

(b) *Epist.* 1, & 4. *apud Binium.*
(c) *Presbyteris, Diaconis, Subdiaconis & Monachis concubinas habere, seu Matrimonia contrahere, penitus interdicimus; contracta quoque Matrimonia ab hujusmodi personis disjungi.* Grat. dist. 27. c. 8. (d) *Sess.* 24. *Can.* 9.

But one would think, that God had sufficiently declared his approbation of such Marriages, in that the whole World hath by his appointment been twice peopled by two married Priests; first by *Adam*, secondly by *Noah*. And we are sure the Holy Scripture tell us, *That Marriage is honourable in all* (*f*). And places it among the Qualifications of a Bishop, *That he be the Husband of one Wife, having faithful Children* (*g*), which saith S. *Chrysostom*, *The Apostle prescribed to this end, That he might stop the Mouths of Hereticks, who reproached Marriage; declaring thereby, That Marriage is no unclean thing, but so honourable, that a married Man may be exalted to the sacred Throne of a Bishop* (*h*).

(f) Heb. 13. 4.
(g) Tit. 1. 6.
(h) Ἐπιστομίζει τοὺς αἱρετικοὺς τοὺς τὴν γάμον διαβάλλοντας, δεικνὺς ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναγὲς, ἀλλ' οὕτω τίμιον, ὡς μετ' αὐτοῦ δύνασθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἅγιον ἀναβαίνειν θρόνον. Chrysost. Hom. 2. in c. 1. ad Tit.

And well might he think it not unbecoming a Bishop, when our Lord thought it not unbecoming an Apostle, no not the Prince of the Apostles (as the Romanists will have him) for it is without doubt, that S. *Peter* was married; in that the Scripture makes mention of his Wife's Mother (*i*). And *Clemens* of *Alexandria* tells us, That it was certainly reported, that when he saw his Wife led to death, he rejoiced; and having exhorted and comforted her, he called her by her name, and bid her remember the Lord (*k*); and that he was not only married, but begat Children, the same *Clemens* in another place affirms (*l*). Yea that S. *Philip* and S. *Jude* were also married, and had Children, *Eusebius* is witness (*m*).

(i) Matt. 8. 14.
(k) *Clemens Alex. Stromat. l.* 7. *p.* 736. *Lut.* 1629.
(l) *Stromat. l.* 3. *p.* 448.
(m) *Euseb. Eccles. Hist. l.* 3. *c.* 20, & 31.

In

In like manner we find, That many of the primitive Biſhops were married, ſo were *Cheremon* Biſhop of *Nilus*, S. *Spiridion*, S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, S. *Hilary*, and many more.

Nor can it be ſaid, that they took Wives while they were Laymen, and after they took upon them the ſacred Miniſtry, were ſeparated from them; ſince the Canons commonly called the Apoſtles, did prohibit either Biſhop, Prieſt or Deacon to put away his Wife, upon pretence of Religion (*n*); and if any ſuch ſhall abſtain from Marriage, as in it ſelf abominable, command that he be corrected, or depoſed and caſt out of the Church (*o*); which Canons, though not made by them whoſe name they bear, yet they are of greater Antiquity than the firſt *Nicene* Council. And when in that Council it was moved, That Biſhops and Prieſts, Deacons and Sub-deacons, might not cohabit with their Wives, which they had taken before Ordination; the Motion was preſently daſhed by the famous *Paphnutius*, who was himſelf a ſingle perſon (*a*). Yea, a long time after this Council, we meet with many Popes, who were Sons of Biſhops and Prieſts: Pope *Theodorus*, *Silverius* and *Gelaſius* I. were the Sons of Biſhops; Pope *Boniface* I. *Felix* II. and *Agapetus* I. were the Sons of Prieſts (*b*). And that we may not think this ſtrange, *Gratian* himſelf informs us, That the Marriage of Prieſts was in thoſe days lawful in the *Latin* Church, as it was at that time when he writ, in the *Eaſtern* Church (*c*).

(*n*) Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, μὴ ἐκβαλλέτω προφάσει εὐλαβείας. Can. 5.

(*o*) *Canon.* 50.

(*a*) *Socrat. Eccleſiaſt. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 11.

(*b*) *Grat. diſt.* 56. *c.* 2. *Platina in vitis eorum.*

(*c*) *Diſt.* 56. *c.* 13.

Nor is this Doctrine to be rejected only as contrary to Scripture, and to Primitive and Apoſtolical Practice, but becauſe of the abominable Fruits produced in the Church of *Rome* by it. For when their Clergy might not have Wives (which God allowed) inſtead of them they took Whores; which wickedneſs ſo far prevailed in that Church, that no leſs a Man than the Cardinal of *Cambray* informs us, *That many Clergymen were not aſhamed publickly, and in the face of the World to keep Concubines* (*d*). And the Gloſs upon *Gratian* ſays, *That it is commonly ſaid, That a Prieſt may not be depoſed for ſimple Fornication, becauſe there are few Prieſts to be found without that fault* (*e*). And therefore Pope *Pius* II. had great reaſon to ſay, *That though Prieſts were by the* Weſtern *Church forbid to Marry for good reaſon, yet there was ſtronger reaſon to reſtore Marriage to them again* (*f*). This

(*d*) *De reform. Eccleſ.*

(*e*) *Communiter autem dicitur, quod pro ſimplici fornicatione quis deponi non debet, cum pauci ſine illo vitio inveniantur, Diſt.* 81. *c.* 6. *in Gloſſ.*

(*f*) Father *Paul*'s Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 7. *p.* 680.

many

many in the Council of *Trent* were ſenſible of, *Who alledged the great Scandal given by incontinent Prieſts, and that there was want of continent perſons fit to exerciſe the Miniſtry* (*g*). And therefore the Emperor and the Duke of *Bavaria* required, That the Marriage of the Prieſts might be granted (*h*). And the Archbiſhop of *Prague*, and the Biſhop of *Five-Churches* deſired that married perſons might be promoted to Holy Orders. But this requeſt would not be granted, becauſe if the Clergy once come to be Married, they will no longer depend on the Pope, but on their Prince (*i*).

(*g*) P. 679, 680.

(*h*) P. 514, & 526.

(*i*) P. 680, & 747.

(6.) The Doctrines of the number of the Sacraments; of the Character impreſſed by them; and of the neceſſity of the Prieſts intention, defined by the *Roman* Church as neceſſary Points of Faith, are ſuch as cannot be derived from Scripture, or from the Tradition of the Church; as is freely acknowledged by many learned men of their own Communion.

As the Word *Sacrament* is ambiguous, ſo it is ſufficiently known, That the Fathers, as they took it in a more ſtrict or large ſenſe, ſo they either encreaſed or leſſened the number of them: And *Caſſander* hath obſerved, That we ſcarce meet with any Man before *Peter Lombard*, who reduced them to a certain number (*k*). And that the number Seven hath no colour, either from Scripture, or the antient Church, we may be aſſured by thoſe goodly Reaſons, upon which it was eſtabliſhed by the Council of *Trent*, *viz.* There are ſeven Vertues, ſeven Capital Vices, ſeven Defects, which came by Original Sin, ſeven Planets, and I know not how many ſevens more (*l*), and therefore there are ſeven Sacaments, neither more nor leſs. *Riſum teneatis?*

(*k*) *Conſult. Caſſand. Art.* 13.

(*l*) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent. l.* 2. *p.* 234, 235.

As to the Character impreſſed by three of them (*viz.* Baptiſm, Confirmation and Order) 'twas ſo little underſtood by the *Trent* Fathers, that they could not agree what it meant, or where to place it. One would have it to be a Quality, another to be a Relation; and of thoſe who made it a Quality, ſome ſaid it was one kind of Quality, others that it was another, ſome placed it in the Eſſence of the Soul, ſome in the Underſtanding, ſome in the Will, *&c.* (*m*).

(*m*) P. 239.

And in caſe the intention of the Prieſt be neceſſary, then as the Biſhop of *Minori* unanſwerably argued in that Council, If a Prieſt having charge of four or five thouſand Souls, be an Infidel, but a formal Hypocrite, and in abſolving the Penitent, baptizing of

of Children, and conſecrating the Euchariſt, have no intention to do what the Church doth, it muſt be ſaid, that the Children are damned, the Penitent not abſolved, and that all remain without the Fruit of the Communion (*n*). And what an horrible abuſe is it, to make ſuch things as theſe Articles of Faith? and impoſe them upon all Men, to be believed under peril of Damnation?

(n) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 2. *p.* 241.

(7.) The Doctrine of Merits. That the good Works of juſtified Perſons be *truly* meritorious, deſerve not only the increaſe of Grace, but eternal Life, yea an increaſe of Glory (*a*).

(a) *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 6. *Can.* 32.

Whereas the Scripture tells us, *That our goodneſs extends not to God* (*b*); That not only all that we do, *But all that we can ſuffer, is not worthy to be compared with the Glory that ſhall be revealed* (*c*): *That when we have done all thoſe things which are commanded us, we are ſtill unprofitable Servants, and have done no more than what was our duty* (*d*). That we can give nothing to God, but what we have firſt received from him; that we are obliged to him for the good we do, as well as for that we receive; ſince all our good Works are entirely owing to his Grace, are the free Gifts of his Holy Spirit, who *worketh in us both to will and to do* (*e*).

(b) Pſal. 16 2. (c) Rom. 8. 18. (d) Luk. 17. 10. (e) Phil. 2. 13.

Yea even Reaſon it ſelf teaches us, That whatſoever we are, and whatſoever we have, it is all received from him; that we can give nothing to him, that it ſhould be recompenced to us again; that the beſt Services we can perform are no matter of favour, but a Debt we owe him; and in caſe they were wholly our own, yet if put in the Ballance with that exceeding and eternal weight of glory, would be infinitely too light.

Though therefore we readily grant, That our good Works are not only Conditions, but neceſſary Qualifications by which we are made meet to be partakers of the Inheritance of the Saints in light, and without which we are not ſo much as capable of enjoying it; though we do not condemn the Word *Merit*, in that large ſenſe in which it was uſed by the ancient Doctors of the Church, as it ſignifies a Work that is praiſe-worthy, and to which God hath promiſed a Reward, as it denotes a Means appointed by God, in order to the bringing us to Heaven: Yet we can in no wiſe grant, That any Works of ours, are truly, and in a proper ſenſe meritorious; but whatſoever right is thereby acquired to eternal Life, it is founded in the gracious Pro-

miſe of God, who hath declared that he will reward our poor and imperfect ſervices with *Glory, Honour and Immortality.*

(8.) Though every ſin be in its own nature deadly, yet the diſtinction of ſins into Mortal and Venial, is in a ſenſe admitted by Proteſtants, *viz.* If by *Mortal* be meant ſuch a grievous ſin, as actually excludes a Man from the favour of God, and puts him into a ſtate of Damnation; as all thoſe do, mentioned 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. and every other wilful ſin. By *Venial*, ſuch a lighter ſin, for which God in the Goſpel-Covenant makes allowances, and which he will not impute to Condemnation, to thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to do whatſoever he commands; as ſins of Ignorance and meer Infirmity.

But this diſtinction as it is commonly explained and applied by the Romiſh Doctors, is plainly deſtructive of a holy Life, and one of the greateſt encouragements to Vice. For a Venial Sin in their Divinity, is a Sin, that in its own nature is ſo light and ſmall, that it cannot deprive a Man of the favour of God; or render him obnoxious to eternal Death *(a)*. And if you ask them, What Sins in particular theſe Venial Sins are, ſcarce any Sin can be named, but ſome or other of their moſt approved Caſuiſts, will tell you, It is no more than Venial; even Lying and Slandering, falſe Witneſs and Perjury, Theft and Covetouſneſs, Gluttony and Drunkenneſs, are placed in the Catalogue of theſe little harmleſs Sins. Now let theſe Venial Sins be never ſo numerous, the greateſt evils which (according to their Doctrine) they can expoſe a Man to, are no more than the temporary pains of Purgatory; and theſe (they tell us) may be bought off at ſo cheap a rate, that there is no Man in ſuch unhappy circumſtances, but he may purchaſe his releaſe from them. And what then remains to give check to a Mans ſinful appetites?

(a) *Peccatum aliquod dicitur Veniale ex natura ſua, & propria ratione; & eſt illud, quod ex ſe, & ſua natura, eſt tam leve & tam minutum, ut non valeat aliquem privare gratia divina, aut facere illum Dei inimicum, aut reddere illum dignum morte æterna.* Alphonſ. de Caſtro adverſ. Hareſ. l. 12. fol. 210.

(9.) But for their looſneſs in Venials, ſome may think they have made amends by the ſeverity of their Doctrine concerning Mortal Sins. For no Man (as their Church teaches) can obtain the pardon of theſe, without confeſſion to a Prieſt, and performing the Penances he impoſes for them. And this Confeſſion muſt be compleat; not only of the kinds, but of the particular Sins, together with the circumſtances which change the kind, that

that a Penance may be enjoined proportionable to them (*b*).

But beſides that we find no ſuch ſort of Confeſſion required by Chriſt or his Apoſtles; no, nor uſed in the Church for more than four hundred Years: But on the contrary, that our bleſſed Saviour propoſes pardon of Sin, how Mortal ſoever, upon condition of ſincere Repentance and new Obedience; beſides that, the thing it ſelf is unpracticable: For how ſhall an ignorant Mechanick know, what thoſe circumſtances are that change the kind? When perhaps his Confeſſor is not able to tell him? How ſhall he know, which Sins are Mortal, and which are Venial? when their moſt learned Caſuiſts are at no agreement among themſelves about them, but that which one ſays is Mortal, another ſays is no more than Venial, and their ſeraphical Doctor affirms, *That many Sins are believed to be Venial, that are Mortal, and it is a moſt difficult thing to diſcern the one from the other* (*c*). Beſides, I ſay, theſe and many other inſuperable prejudices that lie againſt it; as the matter is managed in the Church of *Rome*, it wholly defeats its own deſign. For what Man will be aſhamed to do that, which is done upon courſe, by the beſt Men in their Church; the Prieſt, the Biſhop, yea the Pope himſelf not excepted? And who will be afraid of the moſt formidable Sin, when the Penance impoſed for it is uſually trifling, and next to nothing; ſo far from giving check, that it is one of the ſtrongeſt provocations to ſin? For what greater encouragement can a Man deſire, than to purchaſe a pardon upon ſuch eaſie terms?

(b) *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 5. *de Pœnitent. Can.* 4, & 7.

(c) *Multa enim frequenter creduntur eſſe Venialia, quæ Mortalia ſunt, & difficillimum eſt in talibus diſcernere.* Bonavent. *l.* 2. *diſt.* 24. *par.* 2. *Dub.* 1.

(10.) I need not ſhew, that the Doctrine of Purgatory, as taught by the Church of *Rome*, cannot derive its Pedigree, either from the Scripture, or the Primitive Fathers; becauſe it is freely confeſſed by many of her own Members, that it hath no foundation in either of them. Yea a late learned Writer of that Church, hath proved by great variety of Arguments, that it is plainly repugnant to Scripture, to Reaſon, and to the judgment of the ancient Church, and expoſed the vanity of thoſe pretended Proofs which are commonly brought for it (*d*).

(d) *Tho. Ang. ex Albiis Eſt-Saxon. de medio Animarum ſtatu.*

And yet it is no wonder, that the *Romiſh* Clergy ſo zealouſly contend for it, that the Council of *Trent* hath eſtabliſhed it,

and that Pope *Pius* IV. hath put it into the *Roman* Creed (*e*), because this is that by which they make ſpoil of the People, and enrich themſelves. This alone hath erected and richly endowed many fair Abbies and Monaſteries; this hath founded many Colleges, Chappels and Chantries; this hath ſet up and maintained the gainful Trade of Indulgences and Maſſes: Let the People be once diſabuſed, and rightly informed in this Point, Maſſes for the Dead will grow out of faſhion, and Indulgences will be deſpiſed as nothing worth. For,

(e) *Bull. ſuper formam Juramen. Confeſſ. Fidei.*

(11.) The Doctrine of Indulgences is another new Article of the *Roman* Creed. This is generally owned by the learned Romaniſts themſelves: In particular, *Durandus* (one of their famous Schoolmen) acknowledges, *That little that is certain can be ſaid concerning them, becauſe the Scripture ſpeaks not expreſly of them; and the holy fathers, S.* Ambroſe, *S.* Hilary, *S.* Auguſtine, *and S.* Jerom, *make no mention of them* (*f*). And Cardinal *Cajetan* grants, *That no ſacred Scripture, no Authority of the ancient Doctors,* Greek *or* Latin, *hath brought the Original of them to our knowledge* (*g*). And no wonder, becauſe their Original bears a much later date than either the Sacred Scripture, or the Authority of the ancient Doctors; for the learned Romaniſt before-mentioned tells us, That for ought he could find, Indulgences were not thought on, before the Age of the Schoolmen (*h*), that is, till twelve hundred Years after Chriſt; and therefore no mention is made of them by *Gratian*, or the Maſter of the Sentences.

(f) *De Indulgentiis pauca dici poſſunt per certitudinem, quia nec Scriptura expreſſe de eis loquitur: ſancti etiam, ut Ambroſius, Hil. Aug. Hieron. minime loquuntur de Indulgentiis.* Durand. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 20. *q.* 3.

(g) *De ortu Indulgentiarum, ſi certitudo haberi poſſet, veritati indagandæ opem ferret: verum quia nulla ſacræ Scripturæ, nulla priſcorum Doctorum, Græcorum aut Latinorum, authoritas ſcripta hanc ad noſtram deduxit notitiam.* Opuſc. Tom. 1. Tract. 15. c. 1.

(h) *De his Indulgentiis ante Scholaſticorum ætatem, quod ſciam, ſalpirio nulla.* De medio Animarum ſtatu, Demenſ. 27.

It is true, That in the Primitive Church, ſevere and long Penances were impoſed upon ſcandalous Offenders, the rigour of which, upon weighty Conſiderations, was ſometimes moderated by the Biſhop; and this Relaxation was called by the name of Indulgence. But the Popiſh Indulgences are quite of another nature; for they ſuppoſe a Treaſure in the Church, made up of the Merits of Chriſt and the Saints (the Saints muſt be added to ſupply the defect of Chriſt's Merits) which is wholly at the Popes diſpoſal, which therefore he diſpenſes to others as he thinks fit, to diſcharge them from thoſe Temporal Puniſhments to which they are obnoxious, for their venial Sins, in Purgatory.

Nor

Nor are these Indulgences (as the Practice of their Church is) limited to the Souls in Purgatory, and to those Punishments which are due to venial Sins only; but granted to all Persons indifferently who will pay for them; and for all Sins, be they never so enormous.

To such an excess of Abomination, were the Doctrine and Practice of Indulgences grown, about the time of the Reformation; such an intolerable Reproach were they to our Holy Religion, that the more sober Romanists themselves cry'd shame on them (*i*).

(i) *Espencæus in cap. 1. Ep. ad Tit.* Onus Ecclesiæ. *c.* 15. *Eras. l.* 30. *Ep.* 57.

(12.) Another Error (and that which is, indeed, the main Foundation of many of those already mention'd, and of many more which follow under the next Head), is this, That unwritten Traditions ought to be added to the Holy Scriptures, to supply their defect; and ought to be receiv'd as of equal Authority with them.

Whereas the Scriptures themselves, (which the Romanists acknowledge to be an infallible, tho' but an imperfect Rule) do frequently bear witness of their own Sufficiency, as to all Matters necessary to Salvation (*a*): I say, *all Matters necessary to Salvation*; because we do not assert, that all things belonging to Rites and Ceremonies, and to the external Polity of the Church, are contain'd in them, except only in general Rules, by which the particular Determination of them is committed to the Discretion of our Governors; but we affirm, that there is no Article of Faith, or Rule of Life, that is necessary to be believ'd or practis'd, that is not either in expres words contain'd in them, or by evident consequence may be deduced from them; so that supposing them to be the Word of God, we need no other Rule in such Matters.

(a) Psal. 19. 7. John 20. 31. 2 Tim. 3. 16.

And 'tis certain, that the ancient Fathers were of the same Judgment. I shall produce the words of S. *Austin* only. *In those Matters*, saith he, *which are plainly placed in Scripture, all those things are found, which contain Faith, and the Manners of Holy Living*, viz. *Hope and Charity* (*b*). In which words he affirms, not only that all things belonging to Faith and Manners are contained, but that they are plainly contain'd in the Scripture. And in another place the same Father says, *If an Angel from Heaven shall preach to you, any thing concerning Christ, or his Church, or concerning any thing which belongs to Faith or Life, besides what you have*

(b) *In iis quæ aperte in Scriptura posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, mores, vivendi; spemsc. atque Charitatem. De doct. Christiana, l.* 2. *c.* 9.

received

received in the Writings of the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed (c).

(c) *Proinde si- ve de Christo, ve de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re, quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque nostram,* &c. Aug. contra literas Petil. l. 3. c. 6.

'Tis true, the Fathers in their Contests with Hereticks, do frequently press them with the Tradition of the Catholick Church; But then it must be remembred, that the Hereticks, against whom they disputed, were either such as denied the Authority of the whole, or a great part of the Scripture; or such as insisted upon Tradition, and pleaded that in defence of their Errors; that therefore they might beat them at their own Weapons, the Fathers confuted them by Tradition too: But they never set up Tradition as another Word of God, or sought thereby to establish any thing as an Article of Faith, or a piece of necessary Worship, that they thought was not to be found in the Scripture; As the Church of *Rome* does, which under pretence of Apostolical Tradition, obtrudes upon the Christian World, as Matters of necessary Belief and Practice, such things as are but of yesterday; such things as are doubtful and uncertain; such as are childish and trifling; yea, such as are false and impious, plainly contrary to Scripture, and to Primitive Doctrine and Practice.

That I may not be over tedious, I forbear to mention many other Errors in Doctrine, and proceed to the next general Head of Corruptions.

2. The Church of *Rome* hath not only err'd in Doctrines of Faith, but hath also grosly swerv'd from that Rule of Worship which Christ hath given us, and from the Practice of the Primitive Church; and set up a Worship of their own invention in direct opposition thereunto. I shall instance in some Particulars.

First, In having their publick Worship in an unknown Tongue. This is expressly condemn'd by our Church, as a Practice plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and to the Custom of the Primitive Church (d).

(d) *It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the Custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayers in the Church, or to administer the Sacraments in a Tongue not understood of the People.* Articles of Religion, *Anno* 1562. Art. 24.

That

That it is plainly repugnant to the Word of God, no Man can be ignorant, who knows what is written in the fourteenth Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, in which the Apostle so directly, and with such variety of Arguments, confutes this unreasonable Service, that 'tis as easie to make midnight and noonday meet, as to reconcile them one to the other.

Nor is it less contrary to the Custom of the Primitive Church. That in the first Ages of Christianity, every Christian Church had the publick Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments in their own Tongue, I need not prove, by citing the Testimonies of those Persons, who liv'd in those Ages; because the learned Men of the Church of *Rome*, do themselves confess it, which is a Proof more convincing, than a thousand other Witnesses. Out of many which offer themselves, I shall produce a few, whose Authority is beyond exception.

Their great *Aquinas* grants, *That it was madness in the Primitive Church, to speak in a Tongue not understood; because they were rude in Ecclesiastical Rites, and did not know those things that were done, unless they were expounded: But now,* saith he, *that all are instructed, tho' all things are spoken in the* Latin *Tongue, they know what is done in the Church (e).* Cardinal *Bellarmine* grants, *That in the Primitive times, because the Christians were few, all sang together in the Church, and answer'd in the divine Offices; but afterward the People encreasing, it was left to the Clergy alone to perform Prayers and Praises in the Church (f).* Mr. *Harding* to this Exception of the Protestants, *S.* Paul *requires that the People give assent to the Priest by answering to his Prayers made in the Congregation,* returns this answer: *Verily in the Primitive Church this was necessary, when the Faith was a learning; and therefore the Prayers were made then in a common Tongue, known to the People, for cause of their further instruction, who being of late converted to the Faith, and of* Painims *made Christians, had need in all things to be taught,* &c. And again, *Whereas S.* Paul *seemeth to disallow praying with* [a strange] *Tongue in the common Assembly, because of want of edifying, and to esteem the utterance of five words or Sentences with understanding of his meaning, that the rest may be instructed thereby, more than ten thousand words in a strange and unknown Tongue; all this is to be referred to the State of that time, which is much unlike the State of the Church we be now in: They needed instruction, we be not ignorant, of the chief Points of Religion: They were to be taught in all things; we come not to Church specially and chiefly to be taught at the Service, but*

(e) *Aquin. Comment. in* 1 ad Corinth. c. 14. Sect. 5.

(f) *Bell. de verbo Dei, l.* 2. c. 15.

to

to pray, and to be taught by preaching: Their Prayer was not available for lack of Faith, and therefore was it to be made in the vulgar Tongue for encreaſe of Faith; our Faith will ſtand us in better ſtead, if we give our ſelves to devout Prayer (*g*). Thus we ſee he grants, that the publick Prayers were in the Apoſtolical times in the vulgar Tongue, and that 'twas neceſſary they ſhould be; but nothing can be more falſe and abſurd than the reaſon he gives, why 'twas neceſſary then, and not now. Add to theſe the infallible Teſtimony of Pope *Gregory* VII. who tho' he would not permit the Celebration of Divine Offices in the *Sclavonian* Tongue; yet confeſs'd that the Primitive Church had them in the vulgar Language (*h*).

(g) *Artic.* 3. *Diviſ.* 28. & 30.

(h) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent. l.* 6. *p.* 578.

So that by the Confeſſion of the Romaniſts themſelves, the Church of *England* has in this Point no further departed from the Church of *Rome*, than the Church of *Rome* hath from the ancient Church. If they can inſtance in any Church in the World, that for above five hundred years after Chriſt, worſhip'd God in a Language that the People did not underſtand, we will yield the Cauſe.

And may it not juſtly be matter of amazement, that for the ſerving of ſome poor worldly ends, the Church of *Rome* ſhould introduce a Practice, that renders the Worſhip of God uſeleſs and inſignificant? That deſtroys not only the end of Prayer, but is inconſiſtent with the nature of it? That is ſo abſurd and unreaſonable, that S. *Paul* thought they deſerv'd to be reckon'd Mad-men, who in ſuch ſort pray to God (*i*).

(i) 1 Cor. 14. 21.

So evident is this; that many great Men of the Church of *Rome*, acknowledge it would be better to have the publick Offices in the vulgar Tongue. So Cardinal *Cajetan* confeſſes, *That according to the Doctrine of S.* Paul, *'tis more for the edification of the Church, that the publick Prayers ſhould be ſaid in a Tongue common to the Clergy and People, than in* Latin (*k*). And Mr. *Harding* ſays, *I grant they* (viz. *the People*) *cannot ſay* Amen, *to the Bleſſing or Thanksgiving of the Prieſt, ſo well as if they underſtood the* Latin *Tongue perfectly* (*l*). And Father *Paul* thought the *Latin* Service a great Corruption and Abuſe; as we may ſee in his Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent* (*m*). In which he alſo tells us, *That in the* Roman *Pontifical, there remaineth yet a Form of the Ordination of Readers in the Church,*

(k) *Ex hac Pauli doctrina habetur, quod melius eſt ad ædificationem Eccleſiæ, orationes publicas, quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici lingua communi Clericis & Populo, quam dici latine.* Comment. in c. 14. Ep. 1. ad Corinth.

(l) *Artic.* 3. *Diviſ.* 29. *p.* 587.

(m) *L.* 6.

Church, in which it is ſaid, that they muſt ſtudy to read diſtinctly and plainly, that the People may underſtand (*n*). To conclude this; upon theſe and ſuch like Conſiderations, the Emperor at the Council of *Trent* requir'd, *That Divine Service might be ſo ſaid, that it might be underſtood both by him that ſaid it, and by him that heard it* (†).

(n) *Ibid.*

(†) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*. p. 513.

(2.) Another Corruption is the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs. The Church of *England* doth not quarrel at the name of Sacrifice; ſhe not only grants, but aſſerts, that the Euchariſt is a commemorative and repreſentative Sacrifice. And this was the meaning of the ancient Fathers, who frequenly call it a Remembrance or Commemoration, a Reſemblance or Repreſentation of the Sacrifice which Chriſt once offer'd upon the Croſs (*o*). And this is as much as *Caſſander* ſeems to mean by it (*p*).

(o) *Euſeb. Demonſt. Evang. l.* 1. *c.* 10. Οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν; μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 17. *in Epiſt. ad Heb.* (p) *Caſſand. Conſult. Art.* 24. *de Sacrificio Corp. & Sang. Chriſti.*

But this will not ſatisfie the preſent Church of *Rome*; but Chriſt (as they will have it) is truly and properly ſacrificed; that is, according to their own notion of a Sacrifice, Chriſt is truly and properly put to death, as oft as the Prieſt ſays Maſs. For in a true Sacrifice (as *Bellarmine* tells us (*q*)) the thing ſacrificed, muſt be deſtroy'd; and if it be a thing that hath Life, it muſt be kill'd: And ſo indeed many of the Romaniſts roundly aſſert, that Chriſt every day is by the Maſs-Prieſt.

(q) *De Miſſa. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *&* c. 27

Which beſides, that it is contrary to the Doctrine of the ancient Church, and to the words of the Apoſtle, who tells us, That *Jeſus Chriſt offer'd not himſelf often, as the High Prieſt enter'd into the Holy place every year with the Blood of others; for then muſt he often have ſuffer'd from the Foundation of the World. But now once in the end of the World, hath he appear'd to put away ſin by the Sacrifice of himſelf. And as it is appointed to Men once to die, but after this the Judgment; ſo Chriſt was once offer'd to bear the ſins of many* (*r*). And again: That *after Chriſt had offer'd one Sacrifice for ever, he ſate down on the right hand of God.* And that *by one Offering, he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified* (*s*). And whereas the Apoſtle argues the perfection of Chriſt's Sacrifice, above thoſe of the Law, becauſe thoſe were offer'd year by year, but the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Body was offer'd once for all; If Chriſt be daily ſacrific'd in the Maſs, the Sacrifice of Chriſt muſt be much more defective, than thoſe

(r) Heb. 9. 25, 26, 27, 28.

(s) Heb. 10. 10, 12, 14.

of the Law: for one Sacrifice of Expiation for the whole Congregation of *Israel*, was thought ſufficient for the whole year; Whereas the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Body is repeated every day: Yea, for one ſingle Perſon he may be ſacrificed a thouſand times over, and this Sacrifice ſo often repeated, and a thouſand times more, may perhaps be of ſo little Virtue, as not to procure the releaſe of that one poor Soul out of Purgatory.

Conſider further, that this is inconſiſtent with the end they aſſign of Sacrifice, which is to teſtifie our ſubjection to God; which cannot be done by offering up God himſelf in Sacrifice; for what we offer in Sacrifice, we are not ſubject to, but have the diſpoſal of, and dominion over it.

Beſides all this, 'tis a piece of Worſhip more abſurd and impious, than was ever practis'd by the moſt barbarous Heathen; they indeed ſometimes offer'd their Sons and Daughters in Sacrifice, but we never read that they were ſo ſottiſh, as to make a Sacrifice of their God. And therefore our Church hath deſervedly condemn'd the Sacrifices of Maſſes, as blaſphemous Fables, and dangerous Deceits (*a*).

(a) Articles of Religion, *anno* 1562. Art. 31.

(3.) The ſolitary Maſs, in which the Prieſt alone, who Conſecrates, Communicates, can no way be reconciled, either with the Doctrine and Inſtitution of Chriſt, who when he had broken the Bread, gave it to his Diſciples, and ſaid, *Take ye, Eat ye*; and commanded his Diſciples to do as he had done: Or, with the words of S. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, who ſuppoſes them to meet together to eat the Lord's Body, and commands them to ſtay one for another (*b*). And from this meeting, the Sacrament was call'd by the Ancients, *Synaxis*, the Collection or gathering together of the Faithful; as it is by us ſtill call'd the Communion.

(b) 1 Cor. 11. 21.

Furthermore, 'tis inconſiſtent with the nature and intendment of the Sacrament; which is a Feaſt of Love, and deſign'd to unite us more cloſely together in brotherly Love one to another, by repreſenting to us, by our eating together at the ſame Table, and partaking of one and the ſame Loaf, that we all belong to one Family, and are Children of one Father.

'Tis contrary to the Practice of the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians; who were wont to aſſemble on the firſt day of the week to break Bread (*c*). And that it was unknown to the Chriſtian Church for many Ages, is freely confeſs'd by the Romaniſts themſelves: Even *Bellarmine* grants, That we no where expreſly read, that the Sacrifice

(c) Act. 20. 7.

Sacrifice was offered by the Ancients, without ſome one or more communicating beſides the Prieſt (*d*); tho' 'tis true, he ſays, we may, by many conjectures, collect that it was: but how weak his Conjectures are, will be evident to any Man who will be at the pains to read them. *Harding* confeſſes, That in the Primitive Church, the People receiv'd every day with the Prieſt; and that private Maſs came in afterward by the negligence and indevotion of the People (*e*). *Caſſander* queſtions, whether ſolitary Maſs came not firſt into uſe after the days of *Gregory* the Great, (that is more than ſix hundred years after Chriſt) and ſhews, how at its firſt riſe, it was diſallow'd and condemn'd, not only by particular Perſons, but by ſome Councils (*f*). 'Tis plain, that it was not in uſe in the Church of *Rome* in ancient Times, and that it cannot be reconcil'd with the *Roman* Office as it now ſtands, in which the Prieſt prays and gives thanks, not only for himſelf, but for the Communicants. And what a mockery is it, for the Prieſt to ſay, *The Lord be with you, lift up your hearts, and let us give Thanks to the Lord God*, when he hath not ſo much as one that partakes with him? And therefore the Church of *England* hath, upon good grounds, aboliſh'd it, and ordain'd, that there ſhall be no Celebration of the Lord's-Supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate (*g*).

(d) *Bell. de Miſſa*, l. 2. c. 9.

(e) Article 1. Diviſ. 7.

(f) *Caſſand. Conſult. de Solit. Miſſis.*

(g) Rubrick after the Communion.

(4.) Another inſtance of groſs Corruption in Worſhip, is the half Communion. That Chriſt inſtituted and adminiſter'd the Euchariſt under both kinds, and that it was likewiſe ſo adminiſter'd by the Primitive Church, I need not prove, becauſe it is expreſly granted by the Council of *Conſtance*, which ſacrilegiouſly forbad the Cup to the Laity. *For tho'*, ſaith the Council, *Chriſt inſtituted and adminiſter'd to his Diſciples, this venerable Sacrament under both kinds of Bread and Wine; and although, in the Primitive Church, it was receiv'd by the Faithful under both kinds; yet notwithſtanding, for the avoiding of ſome Dangers and Scandals, this Cuſtom is, upon reaſonable grounds, introduc'd, that it be received by Lay-People under the kind of Bread only:* And then commands, that no Prieſt ſhall adminiſter it in both kinds to any Lay-Man under pain of Excommunication (*h*).

(h) *Concil. Conſt. Seſſ.* 13.

It may be preſum'd, that the Scandals were great, and the Reaſons weighty, that mov'd the Council to make a Decree in plain defiance to Chriſt's Inſtitution: I ſhall therefore mention them, and leave them to the judgment of the Reader. *John Gerſon*, who

who was himself present at the Council, in a Treatise which he writ in defence of that Decree, hath told us they were these, 1. *The danger of spilling the Wine.* 2. *The danger in carrying it from place to place.* 3. *In defiling the Vessels (which ought to be kept as Sacred things) by being touch'd and handled by Lay-men.* 4. *In the long Beards of the Lay men.* 5. *In keeping the consecrated Wine for the use of the Sick; because Vinegar may be generated in the Vessel, and so the Blood of Christ would cease to be there, and pure Vinegar would be administer'd for the Blood of Christ*; (tho' by the way, if the consecrated Wine be transubstantiated, it seems strange, that it should degenerate into Vinegar.) *Besides, in Summer, Flies may be generated, and sometimes it may putrefie and become loathsome, and some might loath to drink it, because many others had drank of it before.* 6. *Wine would be chargeable, especially in such places where it is scarce. There would be, moreover, danger of freezing in Winter; and there would be further danger, in giving occasions many ways to the People to believe that which is false; As that Lay-men, as to the receiving of the Sacrament, are of equal Dignity with Priests* (*b*). These were the frightful Dangers, and horrible Scandals, which they supposed might arise from permitting the Cup to the Laity. And is it not strange, that such Reasons as these, should move the Council to depart from Christ's Institution? especially when confirm'd with that emphatical command, *Drink ye all of it* (*c*); and when that command had been inviolably observ'd, not only by the Primitive, but by the whole Church, both *Greek* and *Latin*, *Eastern* and *Western*, for twelve hundred years after Christ? For Cardinal *Bona* grants, That the whole Church, both Lay and Clergy, for about one thousand two hundred years, received in both kinds, even in the Church of *Rome* it self (*d*). And *Gregory de Valentia* (tho' a Jesuit) tells us, That the Custom of communicating in one kind, began to be generally received, even in the *Latin* Church, not long before the Council of *Constance* (*e*), which began in the year 1414.

(b) *Gerson. Tract. contra hæres. de Commun. sub utraq; specie.*

(c) Mat 26.27.

(d) *De Rebus Liturgicis*, l 2. c. 18. p. 491.

(e) *Cœpit autem ea consuetudo in Ecclesia Latina esse generalis non multo ante tempora Concilii Constantiensis; in quo tandem pro lege ab omnibus eam consuetudinem esse habendam, decretum est.* Greg. de Valent. de legitimo usu Eucharist. c. 10.

And that this Innovation might be remov'd, and the whole Sacrament administer'd according to Christ's Institution, was earnestly desired, not only by Protestants, but by many Popish Princes and Churches, as is manifest by their requests to that purpose, made

to

to the Pope and the Council of *Trent*. The *French* Embaſſador beſought the Pope, in the name of the King, the Church, and Prelates of *France*, that he would grant the Communion of the Cup to the People (*f*). The Duke of *Bavaria*, at the Council of *Trent*, demanded, by his Embaſſador, the Adminiſtration of the Euchariſt under both kinds; and that not for the Sectaries ſake, to reduce them; but to retain thoſe who as yet continued in Communion with them. The *Bavarian* was ſeconded by the Emperors Embaſſadors, who repreſented to the Council, that not only the Kingdom of *Bohemia* would never be ſatisfied without the Cup; but that there were Catholicks in *Hungaria*, *Auſtria*, *Moravia*, *Sileſia*, *Carinthia*, *Carniola*, *Stiria*, *Bavaria*, *Suevia*, and other parts of *Germany*, who deſired the Cup with great Zeal; that therefore his Majeſty demanded it, not for the Hereticks, but for the Catholicks only (*g*).

(f) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*. l. 5. p. 459.

(g) P. 528, 529.

Tho' theſe already mentioned are Corruptions, which loudly called for a Reformation; yet behold greater Abominations than theſe; As,

(5.) The giving Divine Worſhip to the conſecrated Bread in the Euchariſt. This the Church of *England* hath declared to be abominable Idolatry (*h*).

(h) The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural Subſtances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were Idolatry to be abhor'd of all faithful Chriſtians. *Rubrick after the Communion.*

And that it can be no leſs, is granted by many learned Men of the Church of *Rome*, in caſe the Bread and Wine, after Conſecration, be not really changed into the natural body and Blood of Chriſt, but remain the very ſame for ſubſtance, that they were before. And that there is no ſubſtantial Change wrought in them, we are fully aſſured by Senſe, by Reaſon, by Scripture, and by the Authority of the ancient Church; and if theſe are not ſufficient Grounds of aſſurance, we can be aſſured of nothing; but for ought we know, even we our ſelves, and all that is in the World, may be nothing but Phantaſm and Deluſion.

But ſuppoſe, that upon due Conſecration of the Elements, ſuch an incredible Change were wrought; yet no Man can be ſure that it is indeed wrought, and by conſequence that he is not guilty of foul Idolatry. The reaſon is evident, becauſe upon the Principles of the Church of *Rome*, the Conſecration depends upon ſuch a number

number of Uncertainties, that no Man can ever be certain that it is duly made. For if he be not a true Prieſt that Conſecrates; if he do not pronounce the words of Conſecration, and pronounce them aright; if he do not intend to conſecrate, but to abuſe the People, then no Conſecration follows, and conſequently no ſubſtantial change is effected. And if the *Roman* Doctrine be true, is it poſſible for the People, or for the Prieſt himſelf to know, that he is a true Prieſt? For no man can be ſo, who is not baptiz'd by a Prieſt, whoſe intention was right in baptizing him; and ordained by a Biſhop who intended to do what the Church does: And who can tell, whether the Prieſt that baptiz'd him, or the Biſhop that ordain'd him, had a right Intention? And can any Man tell, beſides the Prieſt himſelf that conſecrates, whether he pronounces the words of Conſecration, or pronounces them as he ought, when the words are utter'd with ſo low a voice, that none can hear what he ſays? And none certainly but himſelf, and the Searcher of Hearts can tell, whether the Prieſt, when he pretends to Conſecrate, may not intend to mock the People. Now in theſe caſes no Conſecration follows, but the Bread remains Bread ſtill, and a Wafer only is worſhip'd inſtead of Chriſt.

And if any ſay, theſe caſes are rare, let a Biſhop of the Church of *Rome* anſwer (*i*). *Would to God* (ſays he) *they were ſo, and that in this corrupt Age, we had not cauſe to doubt they were many. But ſuppoſe they are very few, or but only one: Let there be a knave Prieſt who feigneth, and hath not an intention to adminiſter the true Baptiſm to a Child, who after being a grown Man, is created Biſhop of a great City, and liveth many years in that charge, ſo that he hath ordained a great part of the Prieſts: it muſt be ſaid, that he being not baptiz'd, is not ordain'd, nor they ordained who are promoted by him. So that in that great City, there will be neither Euchariſt, nor Confeſſion, becauſe they cannot be without the Sacrament of order, nor order without a true Biſhop, neither can he receive order who is not baptized. Behold millions of Nullities of Sacraments, by the malice of one Miniſter, in one Act only.* So many uncertainties does Conſecration depend upon in the Church of *Rome*, that it may ſeem highly probable, that not one Sacrament in an hundred is duly conſecrated, and by conſequence, not one Perſon in an hundred that worſhips the Hoſt, but in ſo doing, according to their own Doctrine, he gives that worſhip to Bread, that is due to God only.

(i) Biſhop of *Minori*. Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 2. *p.* 241.

It

It will not ſave them harmleſs, nor ſo much as excuſe them, to ſay that they verily believe it not to be Bread, but the very Son of God; ſince if they do ſo, their miſtake muſt be groſly wilful; there being no ſuch exact likeneſs between Chriſt and a bit of Bread, that any Man can miſtake the one for the other, who is not reſolved ſo to do.

(6.) To make a Picture of God, is forbidden by God himſelf in the Holy Scripture. *Take ye therefore good heed to your ſelves,* ſaith God to the *Jews, (for ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude in the day the Lord ſpake to you in Horeb, out of the midſt of the fire) leſt ye corrupt your ſelves, and make you a graven Image,* &c. (a). (a) Deut. 4. 15, 16.

'Tis repugnant to the very nature of God, who is a Spirit, and can no more be repreſented by a bodily ſhape, than a Thought can. It is an intolerable reproach to, and infinitely derogates from his peerleſs perfections. It was judged an abſurd and a wicked thing, by the ancient Chriſtians, as *Caſſander* confeſſes, and quotes S. *Auguſtin* for the proof of it (b). *We believe,* ſaith that Father, ſpeaking of Chriſt, *that he ſits at the right Hand of God the Father; and yet it is not to be thought, that God the Father is circumſcribed by a humane ſhape; that thoſe that think of him ſhould conceive, that he hath either a right-ſide or a left; or for that the Father is ſaid to ſit, is it to be ſuppoſed, that it is done with bended Knees, leſt we fall into that Sacrilege, for which the Apoſtle abhors thoſe, who changed the Glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeneſs of corruptible Man. For ſuch an Image of God it is unlawful for a Chriſtian to place in the Temple; much more deteſtable, to place it in his Heart* (c). Which words plainly ſhew, what the Judgment of Chriſtians in this matter was, four hundred Years after Chriſt. (b) *Caſſand. Conſult.* Art. 21. (c) *Aug. de Fide & Symbolo*, c. 7.

It was condemned by the wiſer ſort of Heathens, as a thing altogether unſuitable to the Divine Nature. Yea, that very Council which decreed that the Image of Chriſt, and the Saints ſhould be worſhipped, thought it not only unlawful, but abſurd and impoſſible to make an Image of that Being which is Spiritual, Inviſible and Imcomprehenſible (d). And *Durandus*, one of their learned School-men ſays; It is a fooliſh thing to make Images to repreſent God (e). (d) *Concil. Nicen. 2. Actione 4. & Actione 7. in Epiſt. Synodica ad Conſtantinum & Iren.* (e) *L. 3. diſt. 9. q. 2.*

And yet the practice of the Church of *Rome*, not only now, but many Years before the Reformation, was to picture God the Father, and the adorable Trinity; and ſo generally hath this practice obtained, that *Bellarmine* makes that an Argument to prove the

the lawfulneſs of it (f). *For now*, ſaith he, *ſuch kind of Images are almoſt every where received, and it is not credible, That the Church would univerſally tolerate that which is unlawful.* He ſays they are almoſt *every where received*, and that the Church did *univerſally* tolerate them; but in that he ſays, they are *now* received, he plainly grants, that they were anciently rejected.

(f) *Bell. de Imagin. l. 2. c. 9.*

(7.) Another groſs Corruption in the Worſhip of *Rome*, which rendred the Reformation neceſſary, was the Worſhip of Images. This alſo the Church of *England* hath condemned as Idolatrous, and proved it to be ſo, by the Authority of God's Holy Word, and by the Teſtimonies of the ancient Fathers (a).

(a) Homily againſt the peril of Idolatry.

I ſhall not mention the many Scriptures in which God prohibits, and expreſſes his abhorrency of this ſort of Worſhip, and dreadfully threatens thoſe who practiſe it; for that would be to tranſcribe a great part of the *Bible*. Whoſoever can reconcile it with the ſecond Commandment, he need not doubt, but he may make Perjury, and Murther, and Theft, and falſe Witneſſing to become Vertues: Which is indeed no more than the Church of *Rome* does: For to break Faith with Hereticks, to rob and falſely accuſe them, yea and to murther them too, are in their Divinity great Virtues and neceſſary Duties.

So far were the Primitive Chriſtians from worſhipping of Images, that many of the moſt learned of them, thought it was a ſin ſo much as to make them; and others who did not ſcruple the making them, yet thought it unlawful to have them in Churches, though for no other uſe than Ornament: And when ſome in the fourth Century, thought they might be permitted in Churches, they notwithſtanding abhorred the thoughts of giving any manner of Worſhip to them: All which are ſo fully proved by learned Men of our own Church (b), that I forbear to inſiſt upon them: Though it is a matter that needs not proof, becauſe it is confeſſed by *Caſſander*, That the ancient Chriſtians had a great abhorrency for all Veneration of Images (c).

(b) Biſhop *Taylor*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, &c.

(c) *Caſſand. Conſult.* Art. 21.

It is certain the Pope himſelf was an enemy to Image-Worſhip for ſix hundred Years after Chriſt; for *Gregory* the Great, to a certain Recluſe, who deſired the Image of Chriſt, expreſly anſwered, That Images were not to be worſhipped. And in his Epiſtle to *Serenus* Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, though he blame him for breaking the Images in pieces, yet he praiſes him, for that he would not ſuffer them to be worſhip'd; he thought they might be

be of uſe for the inſtruction of the Ignorant, but would not endure that they ſhould be adored. For it is one thing, ſaith he, to adore a Picture, another thing to learn by the Hiſtory of the Picture, what is to be adored; If any Man will make Images, do not forbid him; but by all means avoid the worſhipping of them (*e*).

(e) *L. 9. Epiſt. 9.*

But after that they were once brought into Churches, Men came by little and little to worſhip them; till at length it was eſtabliſhed for a Law in the ſecond Council of *Nice*, that they were to be ſet up in Churches, to the end that they might be worſhipped; and that with true and proper Worſhip; and all thoſe were anathemized who durſt ſay the contrary; which Decree was confirmed by the fourth Council at *Conſtantinople*, and afterwards by the Council of *Trent*.

And though the Worſhip decreed by that Council, was of an inferior nature, yet in proceſs of time, it was advanced by the Church of *Rome* to that ſupreme Worſhip which is proper to God himſelf. For before *Luther*'s time the approved Doctrine of that Church was, That the very ſame Worſhip was to be given to the Image, that was to be given to the Perſon repreſented by it; and therefore to the Images of God and of Chriſt, the Worſhip of *Latria*, that is, That Worſhip which belongs to *God over all bleſſed for ever*. And ſuch as their Doctrine was, ſuch was their Practice; inſomuch that *Caſſander* complains, *That their Worſhip of Images, and their vanity in making and adorning them, was nothing inferior to that of the Heathens* (*f*). We may add, If there was any difference between Heathen and Chriſtian *Rome*, it ſeems to be this; that the latter hath outdone the former, in this piece of Idolatry. Add to this,

(f) *Conſult. Caſſand.* Art. 21. *de Imagin. & Simulachris.*

(8.) Their ſolemn Prayers to Saints departed, and that not to intercede for them, but to beſtow upon them thoſe Temporal and Spiritual Bleſſings they ſtand in need of; which was the practice of the Church of *Rome*, and made a part both of their private and publick Devotions, long before the Reformation.

Now were it ſo good and profitable to invoke the Saints, as the Council of *Trent* teaches; it is ſtrange that ſo great a Lover of Mankind as S. *Paul*, when he ſo frequently commands us to pray, and hath left ſo many directions concerning Prayer, ſhould wholly forget to teach us this Leſſon. Can it be ſuppoſed a Worſhip ſo pleaſing to God, when God hath not given us the leaſt intima-

tion in his Word that it is ſo? For that it hath no foundation in Scripture, we may be aſſured, when ſo great a Man of the Church of *Rome*, as Cardinal *Perron* acknowledges that neither Precept, nor Example, is there to be found for it; and when other learned Doctors of that Church, not only confeſs the ſame, but alſo give us ſeveral Reaſons, why no mention is made of it either in the *Old* or *New Teſtament*.

But this is not all. There is not only nothing in Scripture for it, but much againſt it: For we are there frequently taught, to offer up our Prayers to God alone; through that *one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus*.

And had the Fathers been of opinion, that Saints might be invoked; could they have thought the Invocation of Chriſt, a good Argument to prove his Divinity? Would they have accuſed the *Arians* of Idolatry for worſhipping him, becauſe they ſuppoſed him to be no more than a Creature? Could they be ſo ſottiſh as to deride Heathens for worſhipping dead Men, had they themſelves worſhipped ſuch? And would not the Heathens have retorted their Sarcaſms? When Heathens and *Jews* both, ſo often reproached the Chriſtians, for worſhipping one that was crucified; had they worſhipped not only him, but his Apoſtles and Diſciples too, would they not much more have reproached them for that? But what need of Arguments to prove it, when the Fathers themſelves plainly tell us that they made their Prayers to God alone (*b*)?

(b) *Clemens Alexand. Stromat.* l.7.p.721. *Pariſ. Edit.* 1629. *Tertull. Apol.* c. 30. *Aug. de Civit. Dei*, l.8.c.27.

'Tis unreaſonable to ſay, that the Fathers ſpeak of ſupreme Worſhip only which the Romaniſts themſelves reſerve to God, while they allow an inferior Worſhip to others: Becauſe they were not aware of any ſuch difference of Worſhip. All religious Worſhip, was in their account, ſuch as was due to God alone. The diſtinctions of Worſhip into ſupreme and ſubordinate, abſolute and relative, terminative and tranſient, as they have no foundation in Scripture, ſo the Chriſtians of the firſt Ages were ignorant of, they having no ſuch different objects of Religious Worſhip, to which theſe different Degrees were to be ſuited.

And foraſmuch as the Romaniſts themſelves, make Sacrifice proper to God; it ſeems very abſurd to make Prayer common to him with others. For Sacrifices were not only accompanied with vocal Prayers and Thankſgivings; but were themſelves real Prayers and Praiſes; they being ſacred Rites by which they offered

up

up their Petitions and Thanks to God, as their very names Euctical and Eucharistical teach us. And when Prayer and Sacrifice are considered apart, and compared the one with the other, God sets the higher value upon Prayer, and desires that rather than Sacrifice (*c*). If therefore, Sacrifice be a Worship peculiar to God, it follows *à fortiori*, that Prayer must be so too:

(c) Psalm 50.

As will be further evident from the very nature of the thing; because Prayer is an acknowledgment of those Excellencies in the Person pray'd to, and a payment of those Duties to him, which are the sole Prerogative of God. For what are the incommunicable Perfections of God himself? If not to be present in all places, to know the Secrets of our Hearts, and to be able to supply the wants of all those that call upon him? And all these must be supposed to be in him, to whom Prayers are addressed by all Persons, from all distant places of the World. And what Homage can be more proper to him, who is infinite Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, than to submit our selves to him? To hope and trust in him, and to cast all our care upon him? And all these Duties we pay to that Being, to whom we make our Prayers. And therefore the Church of *England* had great reason to charge them with Idolatry, who put up their Prayers to Saints; because, in so doing, they give that Worship to the Creature, which is due to God alone (*d*).

(d) Homily against peril of Idolatry.

(9.) I might largely insist upon the Worship which the Church of *Rome* gives to the Reliques of Saints, which is more absurd, than that which they give to the Saints themselves.

By their Reliques, they understand not only their dead Bodies, and all the parts of them (their Nails and Hair not excepted) but all those things that any way appertained to them: Yea, whatsoever they touched, and whatsoever touched them, by virtue of that Touch, it becomes Sacred. Upon which account, no things are had in greater Honour with them, than those by which our Blessed Lord was put to shame. The Thorns that gored him, the Nails that pierced him, the Cross he was nailed to, because they touched his Sacred Body, Divine Honour must be given to them, as the great Oracle of their Church hath determined (and by consequence to the *Judas* that betray'd him). Tho' with this difference, that not only to the true Cross, on which our Saviour hung; but to the Image of it Divine Worship is to be paid; but not to the Images of the Nails and Spear,

but only to thoſe very Nails, and that very Spear that pierced him (a).

(a) *Crux Chriſti, in qua Chriſtus crucifixus eſt, tum propter repræſentationem, tum etiam propter membrorum Chriſti contactum Latria adoranda eſt: Crucis vero effigies in alia quavis materia, priori tantum ratione Latria adoranda eſt.*

Quantum ad rationem contactus membrorum Chriſti, adoramus non ſolum Crucem, ſed omnia quæ ſunt Chriſti. Aquin. pars 3. quæſt. 25. Art. 4.

And which is yet more monſtrous; tho' 'tis certain, that theſe pretended Reliques, if not all, yet are moſt of them counterfeit, (unleſs that which is but one, can be a multitude) becauſe the ſame is pretended to be ſhewed in many places; yet the ſame worſhip is given to the falſe, that is given to the true Reliques; and ſo the Body of a Malefactor, is ſometimes worſhipped, for that of a Saint; and the Bones of a Beaſt, for thoſe of a Martyr. But ſuppoſe they are true, are they not goodly objects of Worſhip? Garlick and Onions (the *Egyptians* Deities) may juſtly be accounted Gods right worſhipful, when compared with Thorns, and Nails and Chips, and many other of the *Romiſh* Gods. So ridiculous are the Follies and Impieties, that are often practiſed in this Relique-worſhip, that nothing equal was ever found among the moſt ſottiſh Heathen.

I ſhall therefore ſpare the pains of ſhewing that it is condemn'd by Scripture, by Reaſon, and that nothing like it was practiſed by the Primitive Chriſtians for more than three hundred years; and ſhall only tell you what cenſure, a learned and famous Man of their own Church hath paſſed upon this ſort of worſhip. *It is manifeſt* (ſaith he) *that in later times, too much hath been attributed to the Memories and Reliques of Saints, ſo that even by ſuch good Men as have a pious Zeal, the Summ as it were of Religion, is thought to conſiſt in getting of Reliques, and adorning them with Gold and Jewels, and in building ſumptuous Temples and Memories for the Martyrs; and alſo by wicked Men, a falſe truſt is placed in the needleſs worſhip of Reliques —— And out of covetouſneſs* (ſaith he) *falſe Reliques are forg'd, and feigned Miracles are publiſhed, by which Miracles, the Superſtition of the People is nouriſhed, that they are rather tranſported into admiration of the Miracles, than provoked to the imitation of the Saints, or the amendment of Life. But ſometimes by the Craft and Illuſion of the Devil, abuſing Mens ſuperſtitious Conceits by Dreams and Viſions, new Reliques were revealed, and by his operation Miracles ſeemed to be wrought —— Alſo very many are found, who make merchandize of the Reliques of Saints, whether true or falſe;*

false; so that almost every where, they are carried about by Pedlers and the vilest of Men, and with many Lyes are recommended to the ignorant Vulgar. But since at this day, when every where all places seem to be full of the Reliques of Saints; it is to be feared, that if Bishops and Princes would take that pains which they ought, in searching out and judging of true Reliques, great and detestable Cheats would be discovered. And after some other things of the like import, he concludes: *Since therefore the true and known Reliques of the Saints, especially in these Provinces, are very few, and many of those which are shown, may be justly suspected; and since the frequenting and Veneration of them, does not serve Piety much, but very much serves Superstition and Gain; it seems much more adviseable, that no Reliques should be shewn; and that the People should be provoked to worship the true Reliques of the Saints; that is, to imitate the Examples of their Piety and Virtues, which are extant either in their own Writings, or in the Writings of others concerning them* (a). To conclude this Head, we reverence the Memories of the Saints, especially of the ancient Martyrs; and should we meet with any unquestionable Remains of their Bodies, we should pay more than ordinary respect to them: We bless God for their exemplary Lives and triumphant Deaths, but we dare not worship them, and make them our Gods. I proceed now to the next general Head of Corruptions.

(a) *Consult. Cassand.* Art. 20. p. 973.

3. Corruption of Manners, which at the time of the Reformation, and long before, was grown to that excess, that the great Men of the Church of *Rome* before cited, who called for a Reformation, thought it especially necessary in regard to Manners. And some of them did not stick to publish to the World, that either the ruine of the Church, or some dismal Plagues were near approaching, unless prevented by a speedy Reformation in their Morals. This was the main design of *Gerson*'s Treatise concerning the Signs of the Ruine of the Church. And I am bold to say, says the Cardinal of *Cambray*, in the Preface to his Book of the Reformation of the Church, *That altho' they are great Evils which we see, yet unless the Church be speedily reformed, we shall in a short time see incomparably greater; after those horrid thunders we have already heard, we shall presently hear others that are more horrible.* And the Suffragan Bishop of *Saltzburg*, having described the Vices of the *Roman* Court, he concludes; *'Tis vehemently to be presumed, and cautiously to be feared, that the Ruine of the* Latin *Church, as to its Ecclesiastical Dignity is near* (b).

(b) *Onus Ecclesiæ*, c. 19. fol. 36.

Nor

Nor ſhall we think it ſtrange that conſidering Men apprehended ſuch dreadful Evils were approaching, if we conſider that this deplorable corruption of manners was,

(1.) Univerſal, in all ſtates and Degrees of Men.
(2.) And more eſpecially in the Clergy.
(3.) And moſt eſpecially in the Pope and Cardinals.

(1.) There was a general corruption of manners, both in the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical State. The Cardinal but now mention'd, having recited the ſad complaints S. *Bernard* made of the corrupt State of the Church in his time, he further adds: *If theſe things were ſpoken by bleſſed* Bernard, *they may now much more be ſaid; becauſe ſince his time, the Church hath proceeded from bad to worſe; and in the whole State as well Spiritual as Secular, Vertue being abandon'd, it hath fallen into the ſhame and filthineſs of Vice* (c). And ſuppoſing all States and Orders to be corrupted, he afterwards proceeds to ſhew, what he thought were the beſt Expedients, both for the Reformation of the Church in general, and of the Head and the ſeveral ſubordinate Members in particular. *Nicolas de Clemangis* tells us, *That wicked Perſons did ſo much abound in all profeſſions of Men, that ſcarce one among a thouſand was to be found, who did ſincerely live anſwerable to their Profeſſion; and if there was any one that was honeſt, chaſt and frugal, and did not follow this lewd kind of life, he was made a laughing-ſtock to others, and was preſently call'd, either an inſolent and ſingular Mad man, or an Hypocrite* (d). The deſcription of the corrupt manners, of all orders of Men, both in Church and State, which we find in the Book before-cited (e), is ſo black and tragical, that it can hardly be read without horrour: and that Book was publiſh'd about the beginning of the Reformation. And the Cardinal of *Lorrain* forty years after, in his Speech to the Council of *Trent*, attributes all the diſmal calamities which had befallen the Kingdom of *France*, to corruption of Manners, as one principal cauſe of them (f).

(c) *Faſcic. rerum expetend. ac fugiend. fol.* 203.

(d) *Sed tanta eſt improborum in ſingulis profeſſionibus exuberantia, ut vix inter mille unus reperiatur, qui id quod ſua Profeſſio exigit, ſinceriter faciat. Quinetiam ſi ſimplex aliquis, ſi caſtus & frugalis in Collegio aliquo vel conventu latam & lubricam perditorum vitam non ſectatur, fabula ridicula cæteris efficitur, inſolenſque & ſingularis inſanus aut hypocrita continuo appellatur,* &c. Nic. de Clemang. de corrupto Statu Eccleſ. c. 25. (e) *Onus Eccleſiæ.* (f) Hiſt. of the Counc. of *Trent*, l. 7.

(2.) And no wonder that all fleſh had corrupted their ways, when the lives of the Clergy, which ſhould have been the Salt of the World, were themſelves more corrupt and unſavory, than thoſe of

of the Laity. Cardinal *Julian* in his Epiſtle to Pope *Eugenius* IV. tells him, *That the People were above meaſure incens'd againſt the Eccleſiaſtical State, by the diſſolute lives of the Clergy, for which,* ſaith he, *'tis greatly to be fear'd, unleſs they mend their Manners, leſt the Laymen, after the example of the* Huſſites, *fall foul upon the whole Clergy. And in truth this deformity adminiſters great boldneſs to the* Bohemians, *and gives a fair colour to their Errors, who eſpecially inveigh againſt the filthineſs of the Clergy* (g). The *German* Biſhop before quoted, in the words of *Catharine* of *Sienna*, gives this character of the common Clergy, at the beginning of the Reformation: *The Modern and unhappy Clergy addict themſelves to temporal things, being deſtitute of Divine light; they love themſelves, neglect the love of God, and their Neighbour; they are worſe than worldly Men, whom they deſtroy together with themſelves. They are addicted to Pleaſures and infamous Practices, and neglect the Salvation of the Souls of Chriſt's faithful People. By the lives of ſuch wicked Clergy-men, the Seculars come to be diſobedient and irreverent towards the Church; they are ſeduced by blind Guides, who, Oh ſhame! are ignorant Idiots, Proud, Covetous, Hypocrites, Simoniacal, Luxurious, Envious, ſlow to good Works, prone to Evil,* &c. *Where at this day can be found that Continence in Geſture, Diet, Apparel, and Laughter, that becomes the Clergy? At Banquets, Taverns, Plays and Theatres, they are more frequently found, than in places dedicated to God. How hugely pernicious to the Univerſal Church, the Scurrility, Ignorance, Fornication, Simony, and other crimes are, with which almoſt the whole Clergy is infected, there is no Man doubts* (a). Much more may be found of the like import in the following part of the Chapter. And *Nicolas de Clemangis*, who was himſelf an Arch-Deacon in the Church of *Rome*, repreſents the Clergy of that Church, as the dregs and ſcum of mankind, as perſons who for the generality abandon'd themſelves to the moſt loathſome vices, as may be ſeen in the Margin (b).

(g) *Incitabat me huc venire deformitas & diſſolutio Cleri Alemaniæ ex qua laici ſupra modum irritantur adverſus ſtatum Eccleſiaſticum, propter quod valde timendum eſt, niſi ſeſe emendent, ne laici, more Huſſitarum, in totum irruant Clerum,* &c. Richer. Hiſt. Concil. general. l. 3. c. 2. p. 322, 323.

(a) *Onus Eccleſ.* c. 21. S. 2.

(b) *Jam illud, obſecro, quale eſt, quod pleriſque in Diœceſibus, Rectores Parochiarum ex certo & conducto cum ſuis Prælatis pretio, paſſim & publice Concubinas tenet?* De corrupto Statu Eccleſiæ. c. 15.

Si quis hodie deſidioſus eſt, ſi quis à labore abhorrens, ſi quis in otio luxuriari volens, ad ſacerdotium convolat, quo adepto, ſtatim ſe cæteris ſacerdotibus voluptatum ſectatoribus adjungit, qui magis ſecundum Epicurum quam Chriſtum viventes, & cauponulas ſedulo frequentantes, potando, commeſſando, pranſitando, convivando, cum teſſeris & pila ludendo, tempora tota conſumunt. Crapulati vero & inebriati pugnant, clamant, tumultuantur, nomen Dei & ſanctorum ſuorum polluti ſſimis labiis execrantur, ſicque tandem compoſiti ex meretricum ſuarum amplexibus, ad Divinum Altare veniunt. c. 16.

Nor

Nor were the inferiour Clergy alone, chargeable with these foul immoralities; but the Prelates were as bad, or worse than the Curates. *The Bishops* (says the fore-mention'd Author) *serve their own Tables instead of the Altar; they are unwise in Divine things, while they love the wisdom of the World; they are more employ'd in the Offices of the Exchequer, than in the Works of Christ; they adorn their Bodies with Gold, they defile their Souls with Impurity; they account it a shame to employ themselves in spiritual matters, and their Glory is to meddle with those things that are scurrilous. Hence 'tis said by* Catharine *of* Sienna; *they as Men that are blinded, reckon that to be their Honour, that is truly their shame: contrary to the Canons, they keep about themselves, Pimps, Bawds, Flatterers, Buffoons; such as give themselves wholly to Vanity, instead of Men that are Learned, and of good report.* And a little after: *The Bishops neglect due Hospitality, by neglecting the Poor of Christ, by making themselves fat, by feeding Dogs and other Beasts. and so one Beast feeds another; as if they chose to be of the number of those, against whom the Lord will pronounce that just sentence,* I was poor and ye received me not, therefore depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire. *There are few Bishops who are not covetous, they take by violence other Mens Goods, and wastfully spend the Goods of the Church; they bestow the revenues of the Church, not to pious uses, but upon their own Kindred, upon Stage-players, Flatterers, Huntsmen, Whores, and such like Persons; they rather make provision for the wickedness of Men, than for the necessities of Nature,* &c.

Onus Eccleſiæ, c. 20. S. 3.

S. 9.

This was the complaint of a Popish Bishop in the year 1519. And that the matter was not much mended with the *Romish* Clergy more than forty years after, appears by the Speech of the *Duke* of *Bavaria*'s Embassadour to the Council of *Trent*; in which he tells the Council, that the cause of the evils that were risen among them, was the bad life of the Clergy, whose wickedness was so great, that he could not relate it, without offending the chast ears of the Auditory (*a*).

(a) History of the Council of *Trent*. l. 6. p. 527.

Tho' it may seem strange that the Clergy, who by their very Calling are oblig'd to exemplary Purity and Holiness, should be so monstrously vicious, yet the wonder will be the less, if we consider,

(3.) That the vicious lives of the Popes and Cardinals were indeed the main source of that deluge of wickedness, in which the inferiour Clergy was immersed. We can desire no better proof of this than the confession of Pope *Adrian* VI. in his instructions

to

to his Legate at the Diet at *Nuremberg* in the year 1522. *Thou ſhalt promiſe*, ſaith he, *that we will uſe our utmoſt endeavours, firſt that this Court may be reform'd, from whence perhaps all this evil hath proceeded; that as from thence the corruption flow'd to all inferiours, ſo from thence the health and reformation of all may proceed* (b). This was a rare confeſſion from a Pope, but no more than what the neceſſity of the thing extorted from him.

(b) *Sleidan. Comment.* l. 4. Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, l. 1. *Richer. Hiſt. Concil. general.* l. 4. part 2. p. 129.

For the Cardinals were by degrees arriv'd to ſuch an exceſs of Pride and Luxury, as was odious and intolerable to all but themſelves, and thoſe whoſe vices were ſupported by them. *If a Man would make an Image of Pride* (ſays *Clemangis*,) *he can no way do it more to the life, than by repreſenting a Cardinal to the Eyes of the Beholders* (c). They trampled upon Biſhops who were their Betters, nor would they vouchſafe ſo much as to ſalute them, when they fell proſtrate upon the ground to worſhip them; which is more than any King ever aſſumed (d) One of themſelves (more modeſt than the reſt) when he returned home laden with the Spoils of *Germany*, being asked in Conſiſtory, what the *Barbarians* (ſo they called the *Germans*) thought of *Rome*, which was ſo kind as to ſend them thoſe choice Wares of Indulgences, anſwered; That *the whole World complained of the Pride and Luxury of the Cardinals* (e). And can any Man think there was not juſt cauſe for this complaint, who will but conſider, what vaſt Revenues were ſpent upon their Luſts? *For not two or three, or ten or twenty Benefices would ſuffice; but a hundred or two hundred, yea ſometimes four or five hundred or more, were uſurp'd by one Cardinal; and thoſe not of the poorer ſort, but the fatteſt and richeſt of all. And well had it been*, ſays our Author, *for the inferior Clergy, had they been content with that prodigious number, but the great miſchief was, that nothing would ſatisfie them, but how great a number ſoever they had, they ſtill more vehemently coveted more* (f).

(c) *Jam vero Cardinalium qui Papæ aſſident ſpiritus, verba tumentia, geſtus tam inſolentes, ut ſi Artifex quiſque vellet ſuperbiæ ſimulachrum effigere, nulla congruentius ratione id facere poſſet, quam Cardinalis effigiem oculis intuentium objiciendo* De corrupto Statu Eccleſ. c. 10.

(d) *Nec pro quocunque Prælato etiam prono adorante eos in terra ponerent manum ad capellum, ut ſalutarent eum: quod nunquam aliquis Rex aut Princeps fecit, neque hodie permitteret.* Reſponſio Apologet. Gallicanæ Nationis de Annat. non ſolvend. apud Richer. l. 2. c. 3.

(e) *Totum orbem conqueri de luxu ſuaque Cardinalium.* Fascic. Rerum expetend. ac fugiend. fol. 203.

(f) *Non quidem duo vel tria, decem vel viginti, ſed centena & ducentena, & interdum uſque ad quadringenta vel quingenta aut amplius. Nec parva & tenuia, ſed omnium pinguiſſima & optima, quibus ſi contenti eſſent, poſtquam ad ſummam illam numeroſam perventum eſt, nec ultra quærerent, proſpere cum pauperibus Clericis, quæ reliquis erant expectant, ageretur: Sed quantumcunque ad numerum aut ſummam venerint, ad amplorem feſtinant, & aſſidue feſtinant, & ardentius feſtinant.* De Cor. Statu Eccleſ. c. 11.

Nor ſhall we think it ſtrange, to hear of ſuch Cardinals, when we conſider what manner of Men the Popes themſelves commonly were. We need not look back to foregoing Ages, in which their own Hiſtorians tell us, they were *Monſters* and *Prodigies* (g); *Such tragical Examples, and ſo devoid of all Piety, as neither to regard the Perſon they ſuſtained, nor the place they were in* (h); that *about fifty Popes together, did utterly degenerate from the Virtue of their Anceſtors* (i). But paſſing over theſe, let us only conſider what the Popes were, about the time of the Reformation, when the World was now grown weary of the burden of Vice, and groan'd to be delivered from it; when (if ever) their worldly Intereſt ingaged them to put on the ſhew, how much ſoever they abhorred the Reality, of Virtue.

(g) *Hæc monſtra, hæc Portenta.* Plat. in vita Benedicti IV.

(h) *Non poſſum non multum mirari, unde tragica hæc Pontificum fluxerint exempla, quam dira pietatis oblivio eorum mentes irrepſerit, ut neque perſonæ quam ſuſtinebant ratio ab his ulla haberetur, neque loci quem tenebant.* Sabellic. Ennead. 9. l. 1.

(i) *Hoc vero uno infelix quod per annos fere 150. Pontifices circiter quinquaginta à virtute Majorum prorſus defecerint.* Genebrard. Chronograph. l. 4.

When after the death of *Innocent* VIII. *Lionel* Biſhop of *Concordia*, in an Oration of the Cardinals, preſſed them with the moſt rowſing Arguments, to chuſe a good Man, whoſe Life was without Scandal (a), What was the effect? *Alexander* VI. was choſen, a Man (if he may be ſo called) who was the Reproach of humane Nature; who before he was choſen Pope, was a Prodigy of Luſt and other Vices; and continued ſo to the laſt, when by the juſt Judgment of God, he was poiſoned by a miſtake, in drinking that Cup himſelf, which he had prepared to diſpatch others (b).

(a) *Raynald,* an. 1492.

(b) *Quos gemitus Chriſtianorum, vita prodigioſa & ſpurciſſima geſta Alexand.* VI. *abundantius & ita quidem excivit,* &c. Richer. l. 4. part 1. c. 2. S. 1.
Cum Alexand. VI. PP. anno 1503. *Veneno quod aliis paraverat, de improviſo extinctus.* Id. S. 3.

Pius III. liv'd not long enough to let the World know what he would prove, for he died within ſix and twenty days after his Election.

Julius II. who ſucceeded him, his Crimes (as *Lewis* XII. King of *France* tells us) were notorious, and ſuch as ſcandaliz'd the whole Church (c). 'Tis certain, he filled *Italy* with Rapines, War and Blood; to which he was ſo addicted, that contrary to the Laws of Nations, he commanded the Procurator of the Duke of *Savoy* to be tortured, becauſe he endeavoured to perſwade him to

(c) *Vide Edict. Reg. Gall. pro Convocat. Concil. Piſani.*

to Peace (*d*). So monſtrous were his Acts, that *Richerius* ſays, he muſt be wholly made of Steel, who can read them without horror (*e*).

(d) *Richer. Hiſt. Conc. general.* l. 4. par. 1. p. 151.

(e) —— *Niſi ob geſta Julii obſtupueris, totus quidem eris ferreus.* p. 150. Sup. l.

Pope *Leo* X. (in whoſe time the Reformation began), was a civil debonair Gentleman; but ſo little concerned for Religion, that he cared not to know what it meant (*f*). When he admitted Diſcourſes of that nature, it was for diverſion ſake, and to make himſelf ſport. His Soul, he thought, was no longer-liv'd than his Body, and therefore he gave himſelf up to ſenſual Gratifications; and 'twas indeed but reaſon, that he who ſuppoſed he ſhould die like a Beaſt, ſhould live like an Epicure.

(f) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, l. 1.

Adrian VI. promiſed fair, but God alone knows, in caſe he had liv'd, whether his performances would have anſwered his promiſes.

Clement VII. as he got the Popedom by Simony (*i*), ſo he adminiſter'd it by as ill Arts as he got it: His prime Virtue was Diſſimulation; he made no conſcience of his Word or Oath, but brake his Covenants as oft as he made them.

(i) Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, l. 1.

Paul III. and *Julius* III. who followed next, the Characters given of them by many of the *Romiſh* Writers, are ſo foul and loathſome, that if I had the face to write them, no modeſt Man could read them without bluſhing.

4. I ſhould now proceed to the laſt general Head of Corruptions, *viz.* Corruptions in Diſcipline. But becauſe that is ſo large a Subject, that 'tis better to ſay nothing, than a little concerning it; and becauſe this Diſcourſe is already ſwell'd beyond the bounds preſcrib'd; and becauſe what hath been ſaid upon the foregoing Heads, is more than enough to evince the neceſſity of Reformation: I ſhall therefore refer the Reader, for ſatisfaction in this Matter, to the Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, written by Father *Paul*; the Review of the Council of *Trent*; Mr. *Gerſon*'s Sermon before Pope *Alexander* V. and his *Declarat. Defect. viror. Eccleſiaſt.* *Clemangis*'s Tracts *de Corrupto Statu Eccleſ.* and *de Reparat. & Ruina Eccleſ.* the hundred Grievances of the *German* Nation; *Eſpenceus*'s Comment on the firſt Chapter of the Epiſtle to *Titus*; the Appeal of the Univerſity of *Paris* from Pope *Leo* X. the

the Articles of Reformation propoſed by the ſelect Council to Pope *Paul* III. The twenty points of Reformation propoſed by the Emperors Ambaſſadors to the Council of *Trent*, and the four and thirty propoſed by the Ambaſſadors of the King of *France*. *Richerius* his Hiſtory of General Councils, *&c.*

F I N I S.